The decorative use of water at Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli and its ancient Roman context

McFarlane, Fiona Ann

The decorative use of water at Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli, and its ancient Roman context

VOL I

Fiona McFarlane
King's College London

PhD
2003

Abstract of thesis

Despite several hundred years of exploration at Hadrian's Villa, there has never been a complete study of its decorative water features - here meaning any area where water has been deployed in a decorative role, whether pool, fountain room or wall, excluding utilitarian buildings such as baths and latrines.

The catalogues included as an Appendix to this thesis describe all the known features and the sculpture which complemented them, critically evaluating the available evidence and eliminating misattributions. 27 structures are identified ranging from relatively simple fountain walls to large complexes involving several different types of water display.

The catalogues enable each feature to be analysed in the main body of the thesis as a representative of a particular architectural type, in the fashion of existing typological catalogues, but also as a structure in its particular physical context, complemented by its decoration. Aspects such as pools and sculptured basins, which have received little attention in the past, are considered in greater depth. Where original location is not recorded, the thesis attempts to resolve the question of where individual pieces of decorative sculpture were originally placed at the Villa. The water features and their decoration are compared to structures and objects from earlier and contemporary Roman dwellings in Italy in order to identify their precedents and improve our understanding of chronological and stylistic development and diversity, taking into account what did not appear at the Villa, as well as what did. Questions about the social roles of water features and the value attached to the display of water at the Villa and elsewhere are explored, including their use in dining, entertainment and the display of wealth. The thesis thus both addresses the absence of a study of the Villa itself, and discusses broader questions about the architectural and social functions of decorative water.

The decorative use of water at Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli, and its ancient Roman context

Volume 1

Volume 2 Appendices and illustrations

Catalogue 1

List of illustrations

8	R2 Cistern fountain	Author photographs 2001/2
9	R2 Cistern fountain	Author photographs 2001/2
10	R3 Fountain room on north side of Residence Quadrangle	Lugli 1927 Tav.2 and Fig.3; author photograph 2001/2
11	R3 Fountain room on north side of Residence Quadrangle	Author photographs 2001/2
12	R4 Fountain in Republican cryptoporticus	Author photographs 2001/2
13	R5 Cavea fountain in east corner of Residence	Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 Fig. 129 and 130
14	R5 Cavea fountain in east corner of Residence	Author photographs 2001/2
15	R5 Cavea fountain in east corner of Residence	Author photographs 2001/2
16	R6 Fountain room behind Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
17	R6 Fountain room behind Water Court	Penna 1831-36 II No.127
18	R6 Fountain room behind Water Court	Sear 1977 Fig.6
19	H1 Water display Large Baths cryptoporticus	Salza Prina Ricotti 1982 Tav.8; Salza Prina Ricotti 1973b Tav.2.
20	H1 Water display Large Baths cryptoporticus	Author photographs 2001/2
21	H1 Water display Large Baths cryptoporticus	Author photographs 2001/2
22	H2 Fountain Court	Förtsch 1993 Taf.67.2
23	H2 Fountain Court Feature 1	Author photographs 2001/2
24	H2 Fountain Court Feature 2 and 3	Author photographs 2001/2
25	H2 Fountain Court Feature 3	Author photographs 2001/2
26	H2 Fountain Court Feature 3	Author photographs 2001/2
27	H2 Fountain Court Feature 4	Author photographs 2001/2
28	H3 East Belvedere	Author photographs 2001/2
29	H3 East Belvedere	Author photographs 2001/2
30	H3 East Belvedere	Author photographs 2001/2
31	H4 East West Terrace	De Franceschini 1991 Pianta 21 after Salza Prina Ricotti
32	H4 East West Terrace	Author photographs
33	H5 Fountain facing Island Enclosure	Winnefeld 1895 Taf.V

34	H5 Fountain facing Island Enclosure	Ueblacker 1985 Beil.3.3, 3.2, 25.2
35	H5 Fountain facing Island Enclosure	Author photographs 2001/2
36	H5 Fountain facing Island Enclosure	Author photographs 2001/2
37	H6 Island Enclosure	MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig.95 with De Franceschini 1991 numbering
38	H6 Island Enclosure	Author photographs 2001/2
39	H6 Island Enclosure	Author photographs 2001/2
40	H7, H8, H9 Location	Winnefeld 1895 Abb.24
41	H7 Fountains on East Terrace adjacent to Residence	Author photographs 2001/2
42	H7 Fountains on East Terrace adjacent to Residence	Author photographs 2001/2
43	H8 Fountain stibadium	Letzner 1999 Taf 135.2; author photographs 2001/2
44	H8 Fountain stibadium	Author photographs 2001/2
45	H9 Fountain room on north side of Residence	Author photographs 2001/2
46	H10 Arcaded Triclinium	MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig.125 with De Franceschini 1991 numbering
47	H10 Arcaded Triclinium	Author photographs 2001/2
48	H10 Arcaded Triclinium	Author photographs 2001/2
49	H10 Arcaded Triclinium	Author photographs 2001/2
50	H10 Arcaded Triclinium	Author photographs 2001/2
51	H11 Peristyle Pool Building	Winnefeld 1895 Taf.11
52	H11 Peristyle Pool Building	De Franceschini 1991 519
53	H11 Peristyle Pool Building	Author photographs 2001/2
54	H11 Peristyle Pool Building	Author photographs 2001/2
55	H12 Stadium Garden	MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig.87 with De Franceschini 1991 numbering
56	H12 Stadium Garden	Hoffmann 1980 Taf.59.1, 59.4; Beil.33

57	H12 Stadium Garden	Hoffmann Beil.29A, 6A
58	H12 Stadium Garden	Hoffmann 1980 Beil.25, 29B
59	H12 Stadium Garden	Author photographs 2001/2
60	H12 Stadium Garden	Author photographs 2001/2
61	H12 Stadium Garden	Author photographs 2001/2
62	H12 Stadium Garden	Author photographs 2001/2
63	H12 Stadium Garden	Author photographs 2001/2
64	H13 Fountain wall adjoining Small Baths	Salza Prina Ricotti 1992 58 and 2001 Fig.114
65	H13 Fountain wall adjoining Small Baths	Author photographs 2001/2
66	H13 Fountain wall adjoining Small Baths	Author photographs 2001/2
67	H13 Fountain wall adjoining Small Baths	Author photographs 2001/2
68	H14 Water Court	Giuliani 1975 Tav.1 with De Franceschini 1991 numbering
69	H14 Water Court	Rakob 1967 Abb.12 and 13
70	H14 Water Court	Rakob 1967 Abb.2
71	H14 Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
72	H14 Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
73	H14 Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
74	H14 Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
75	H15 Water feature adjoining Water Court	Winnefeld 1895 Taf.6
76	H15 Water feature adjoining Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
77	H15 Water feature adjoining Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
78	H16 Fountain room below H15	Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 Fig. 21
79	H16 Fountain room below H15	Author photographs 2001/2
80	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Aurigemma 1961 between 104 and 105
81	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig.138 with De Franceschini 1991 numbering
82	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Del Caldo in Aurigemma 1961 Fig.132

83	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
84	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
85	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
86	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
87	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
88	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
89	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
90	H17 Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
91	H18 Fountain room south east of Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Andreae and Ortega 1989 Figs.46, 50,51
92	H18 Fountain room south east of Scenic Triclinium and Canal	Author photographs 2001/2
93	H19 Upper Park Fountain Wall	Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 Fig.137
94	H20 Park Grotto	Salza Prina Ricotti 1998 Figs. 18, 19
95	H20 Park Grotto	Penna 1831-36 II No.124; author photograph 2001/2
96	H20 Park Grotto	Author photographs 2001/2
97	H21 Reverse Curve Pavilion	Kähler 1950 Taf.13 with De Franceschini 1991 numbering
98	H21 Reverse Curve Pavilion	Penna 1831-36 II No.108
99	H21 Reverse Curve Pavilion	Kähler 1950 Taf.14
100	Catalogue 1 exclusions 16 and 17	Salza Prina Ricotti 1996 Fig.14; author photographs 2001/2
101	Catalogue 1 exclusion 18	Filippi 2001 479 Fig.2; author photograph 2001/2
102	Tripod fountain Louvre	Author photographs 08/2001
103	Tripod fountain Louvre	Author photographs 08/2001
104	Tripod fountain Louvre	Author photographs 08/2001
105	Tripod fountain Louvre	Author photographs 08/2001
106	Michilli	Penna 1831-36 III No.64
107	Tripod fountain Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2

108	Tripod fountain Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
109	Tripod fountain Water Court	Author photographs 2001/2
110	Priest with vase	Author photographs 2001/2
111	Priest with vase	Author photographs 2001/2
112	Head of water god (Oceanus)	Author photographs 2001/2
113	Head of water god (Oceanus)	Author photographs 2001/2
114	Head of water god (Oceanus)	Author photographs 2001/2
115	Nile and Tiber	Author photographs 2001/2
116	Crocodile	Author photographs 2001/2
117	Dancer	Aurigemma 1961 Fig.205
118	Niobid group	Adriano 2000 Cat.41
119	Scylla group	Andreae 1996 5.26
120	?Tripod fountain	Penna 1831-36 IV No.99
121	Oplontis fountain basin paintings	Author photographs 2001/2
122	Villa del Pastore, labrum fountain; San Marco craters	Author photographs 2001/2
123	Museo Nazionale Archeologico di Napoli, tripod fountain and Villa dei Papiri, bronze feline spouts	Author photographs 2001/2
124	Statuary programme reconstructions Sperlonga and Villa dei Papiri	Neudecker 1988 Beil.3 and 2
125	Oplontis	Neudecker 1988 Beil.4
126	Villa of Quintilius Varus; House of Julia Felix	Giuliani 1970 Fig.426; Higginbotham 1997 Fig.98
127	Villa dei Centroni	Cozza 1952 Fig.12
128	Punta Epitaffio, Baiae	Andreae 1999 230
129	Comparison of Sperlonga and Castel Gandolfo Ninfeo Bergantino	De Fine Licht 1974 Fig.36
130	San Marco and the House of Loreius Tiburtinus	D'Amore et al.1983 Pl.A; author photograph 2001/2
131	Domus Flavia oval fountains	Author photographs 2001/2
132	Domus Flavia and Augustana upper	MacDonald 1982 Fig.40
133	Domus Augustana lower	MacDonald 1982 Fig.58

134	Auditorium of Maecenas, Domus Augustana lower	Author photographs 2001/2
135	Bagni di Livia and Domus Augustana, lower	Carettoni 1949 Fig.2; author photographs 2001/2
136	Domus Augustana lower and Villa dei Quintili	Author photographs 2001/2
137	Water steps	Rakob 1964 52.1 and 52.3; Sear 1977 Fig.15
138	Domus Aurea Room 45	Iacopi I 1999 Fig.13
139	Various	Author photographs 2001/2

Acknowledgements

I acknowledge with gratitude above all the support and guidance of my supervisor Professor Geoffrey Waywell, and also my second supervisor Dr. Catherine Morgan.

In Italy thanks are due to the Soprintendenza archeologica per il Lazio, Soprintendenza archeologica di Roma, Amministrazione Torlonia, Soprintendenza archeologica delle province di Napoli e Caserta, and Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei for permission to visit sites and closed areas, museum collections and storerooms. Also to the staff on site for courteous and patient assistance above all at Hadrian's Villa but also on the Palatine, the Villa dei Quintili, and at Stabia, Pompeii and Oplontis, and those working at the Museo Nazionale Romano, Museo Nazionale Romano di Napoli, and the Musei Vaticani. Sig.ra Daniela Bulgarini and her family kindly showed me round the parts of the Villa in their ownership. Dott.ssa Valentina Livi and latterly Dr. Sally-Ann Ashton shared ideas and information on the Villa, Professor Bernard Frischer and John Foss the preliminary results of work on soil samples at Horace's villa at Licenza. In Oxford the Ashmolean Museum gave access to their Scylla group, in London the Sir John Soane Museum let me examine fragments from the Villa and other fountains, and in Paris, the Musée du Louvre enabled me to examine the Villa tripod fountain there.

Thanks to the British School at Rome for a warm welcome during the parts of my three months in Italy I was able to spend there, and especially to the School Secretary Maria Pia Malvezzi for persevering with permessi for those periods and others, and the School Librarian Valerie Scott and her staff for making use of the library possible at all during rebuilding.

Funding for my research was provided by the Central Research Fund of the University of London, the British Federation of Women Graduates Charitable Foundation, the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, the School of Humanities at King's College, London, and above all by Chris Mairs, without whom none of this would have been possible.

1. Introduction

Despite several hundred years of exploration at Hadrian's Villa, latterly more systematic and detailed there has never been a complete study of its decorative water features - 'water features' here meaning any area where water has been deployed in a decorative role, whether pool, fountain room or wall. This thesis addresses the absence of such a study, and goes beyond that, comparing previous and contemporary Roman designs, and exploring their architectural and social functions.[1] A sense of how water features fitted into their buildings or contexts is often lost in existing typological discussions, and, in considering their decorative nature, I have also looked at surface decoration and at the sculpture which adorned them, whether in the form of spouts or other point of exit decoration, freestanding figures or water basins. Until now, architectural structures and sculptured decoration have mostly been discussed in separately and some categories of decorative sculpture – for example water containers - have hardly been considered at all.

Identifying the water features of the Villa

Before work on the wider issues and implications of the features at the Villa could begin, it was necessary first to get a clear idea of what actually existed at the Villa, since it rapidly became apparent that modern lists differed from one another for various reasons. Neuerburg 1965 catalogued 16 features from the Villa, but did not include freestanding pools, for example.[2] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 enumerate different types of water 'installation',[3] but the individual examples are not specified and there appears to be some double counting – for example I cannot find six 'grottoes' distinct from what they class as either large, or single fountains. The list in Ehrlich 1989 appears to rely heavily on brief and unsubstantiated early 20th century references to 'ninfei.'

Thus the first task was to attempt to eliminate misattributions, identify decorative water features securely, and describe each thoroughly, critically examining the detailed

---

[1] Manderscheid 2000a 109-110; MacDonald and Pinto 1995 170 'Roman artistic and atmospheric uses of water are not [well understood].'
[2] Letzner 1999 repeats this list.
[3] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 172.

existing literature, and taking into account my own observations on site. The results – 27 reasonably certain examples - are presented as Catalogue 1 in the Appendix to this thesis. The process by which they were identified is explained in more detail in the explanatory note to the Catalogue. Inevitably there are lacunae – for example because the evidence has been lost or destroyed, or because particular parts of the Villa have not been excavated and recorded. Occasionally the evidence is equivocal and whether a structure was a water feature or not remains a matter of judgement. However, it has been possible to eliminate the most dubious identifications and misidentifications (though for the sake of clarity these are described at the end of Catalogue 1) and arrive at a reasonable understanding of the construction of most features. The plan at Fig.1 (key Fig.2) shows the whole Villa and Figs.3 and 4 show the location of the Republican ('R') and Hadrianic ('H') water features respectively.

The sculpture from the Villa associated with water features was subjected to a similar critical exercise. Although Raeder 1983 carefully identifies and describes the figurative sculpture which can be securely linked with the whole Villa (as well as listing that which has been linked for less strong reasons) he did not consider sculpture such as water containers and masks which is potentially relevant to water features. No full typological study or catalogue of Roman fountain basins yet exists.[4] The results of this element of the research, based on literary and archival work as well as first hand examination of objects, are presented as Catalogue 2 in the Appendix to the thesis, which is divided into three parts. 2A lists and describes securely identified fountain basins from the Villa, 2B fountain figures, and 2C other sculpture associated with water features. 2C is mainly based on the work of Raeder, extracting sculpture linked with the water features from his total Villa corpus. Again, objects previously believed to have come from the Villa, but which I have found reason to exclude, have been enumerated (at the end of the catalogue for 2A and 2B sculpture and in the course of the list at 2C). As with Catalogue 1, lacunae remain – much of the sculpture from the Villa has been destroyed or lost its provenance.

The absence of known find spots for most of the sculpture in Catalogue 2 means that Catalogue 1 and Catalogue 2, which would ideally be combined, must stay separate. Any firm matches between sculpture and location are noted in both Catalogue 1 and 2

[4] Ambrogi 1998 n.4 announces her intention of publishing a monograph on rounded types (not seen).

entries and some speculative discussion of possible sculpture locations is included at appropriate points in the main body of the thesis.

The object of this identification and cataloguing process was not just to achieve clarity and more complete recording of these features and objects. It enabled each feature to be analysed, not only as an architectural type, in the fashion of a typological catalogue, but also as a structure in relationship to its surroundings, and its own decoration.

Finding a context for the Villa

With the base information established in the Catalogues, certain limitations had to be set on the scope of the comparative part of the thesis in order to fit within a three-year research programme. Utilitarian structures such as baths and latrines and drainage are excluded, though the relationship between the design of features inside and outside baths offers scope for further study. Comparisons have been limited geographically to Italian locations dated broadly to the time of Hadrian or earlier, except where there is a clear link or an existing argument to be addressed. Again, expansion of research chronologically and geographically at a later date might shed fresh light on patterns, chronology, or help resolve some of the outstanding questions about the details of design at the Villa.

The Villa is an extraordinary location in terms of size (over 100 hectares, see Fig.1)[5] and (notwithstanding the lacunae in our information) preservation, since it has only been partly built over. Hadrian worked with a very large area, on which, so far as we can tell, there was a relatively small quantity of existing structures, and drew on financial resources which far exceeded those of his contemporaries. His plans for structures and their decoration were limited only by the techniques available, time, and taste. His position was very different to that of even the wealthiest inhabitants of Pompeii, carving out a space within the city walls, and even to that of the other Emperors building within the crowded capital. The Villa has a large number of water features – 27 as catalogued, some of great size and complexity - including the features already on site when Hadrian began building, and this is no doubt an incomplete reckoning of the original total. From one point of view, all this makes the whole collection of water features there unique and literally incomparable, and the issues

[5] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 29 discuss the likely boundaries.

surrounding finding a context for the Villa need to be considered before embarking on comparisons.

The Villa should obviously be compared with the residences created and used by Hadrian's predecessors (essentially, his peers in purchasing power), in any location. In practice this is difficult because, if the evidence at the Villa can be problematic, the situation at other sites is generally much worse, even where ownership is known and can be securely linked to particular buildings.[6] The Domus Aurea and Domitian's villa at Castel Gandolfo[7] have been built over. The Domus Flavia and Augustana on the Palatine have never been fully published. Nero's villa at Subiaco was spread over a wide area and is poorly understood.[8] Trajan's villa at Civitavecchia is hard to read and poorly published.[9] It is difficult to identify which structures were imperial property at Baia or to disentangle the structures there one from one another. Very few sculptural pieces survive from any of them. I have concentrated especially at what we know of the imperial residences in and around Rome which have clearly identifiable decorative water features, such as the Domus Aurea, the Palatine structures, Castel Gandolfo, and Sperlonga.[10] Probably Hadrian was familiar with them, so far as they had not been sold off or buried by his time.

I have also compared structural and sculptural examples from other large non-imperial villas in Italy, such as the larger villas in Campania, at Tivoli and in Lazio generally. Smaller dwellings in towns and cities can also provide context for the Villa especially where other evidence is short. However, in Rome and other continuously occupied cities often only fragments of the whole building or complexes are preserved so that it is hard to see how for example a pool fitted into the complete building. Much of the present evidence for decorative water features at Ostia relates to the third century onwards though the recent discovery of an elaborate mid second century fountain at the Casa di Diana,[11] covered over less than 100 years later, indicates that more may be

---

[6] Leppert 1974 is the only detailed account of imperial villas, though it excludes structures in Rome (not 'villas') and Hadrian's Villa (as too large to cover), and is now almost 30 years old. In the following footnotes references to villas from the catalogue of Romizzi 2001are given where available. Though her accounts are very short and do not focus on water features, she gives detailed up-to-date bibliography.
[7] Romizzi 2001 Cat.11.
[8] Romizzi 2001 Cat.52.
[9] Romizzi 2001 Cat.13.
[10] The focus on water features produces a different short list to, say, Guidobaldi 1994 248 looking at comparisons for the opus sectile pavements of the Villa, or Giuliani 1982 looking at the broader design history of imperial residences.
[11] Marinucci 2001 234ff.

found as the layers beneath the third and fourth century buildings are explored. Moreover, the social conditions which produced for example the water features of Pompeii gardens were different and might produce differences in form as well as scale. The relationship between the contents of sculpture collections in the larger dwellings and those in smaller dwellings is a complex one, in terms of when, and how, they might connect. I have tried to be aware of this in making comparisons and assumptions. Finally, lack of provenance and find spots limits conclusions which might otherwise be drawn from objects in museums about, for example, the display of Niobid groups, or of particular types of fountain basins.

I also considered the question of whether the architecture and decoration of the water features of Hadrian's Villa should be compared thoroughly with the architecture and decoration of water features not owned by an individual, not occupied as a dwelling, and made freely accessible to the public at large. These include fountains by the road or street side, and the pools and fountains in the porticoes and public gardens of Rome and other cities. It is much easier in the modern world to draw a line between public and private architecture than it was in the Roman world where the home was also the place of business, and powerful individuals, above all the Emperor, were expected to receive uninvited as well as invited callers and petitioners in their homes, including their homes out of Rome. Distinguishing as we would between 'public' and 'private' locations is perhaps not quite appropriate. I am also mindful of the fact that Hadrian apparently named some of the buildings at the Villa after 'public' structures, though whether this was because of an actual physical resemblance is not known.[12] However, making a full review of water features in structures other than dwellings in order to compare them with the Villa would have extended the scope of comparison beyond what could reasonably be attempted in the time available. The villas and other dwellings are also closer comparisons in terms of the use(s) to which they were put, which is one of the concerns of this thesis. I have however asked one obvious question about why one particular type of fountain – the monumental façade fountain - does not appear at the Villa, but does appear in other contexts.[13]

---

[12] See 3.2.
[13] 4.4.6.

With the Catalogues underpinning the discussion of the Villa, and the above parameters for context set, I have presented my research and its findings in the main body of the thesis as follows.

Organisation of thesis

Chapter 2 contains general background information about the Villa, and considers what was on the site before Hadrian began building, and what he did with it. 2.1 explains the terms used for Villa structures in this thesis as compared to traditional Villa terminology. 2.2 outlines the building timetable and what the sources tell us of Hadrian's occupation of the Villa. 2.3 summarises what is known of where the Villa obtained its water and how it was distributed. 2.4 reviews the evidence for Roman occupation of the Villa site prior to Hadrian and suggests there was more than one villa there. 2.5 examines how Hadrian decided to deal with the pre-existing structures, and this raises broader questions about the way Romans dealt with standing buildings when they rebuilt, which would merit further study.

In **Chapter 3** I review the present state of research on decorative water features generally and the Villa in particular, assessing the relevant literature critically[14] and explain how I propose to classify structures at the Villa for the purposes of this thesis. 3.1 concludes that discussion which has focused on the use of ancient terms such as nymphaeum does not help the understanding of decorative water features in residential contexts which is the object of this thesis. 3.2 considers existing typologies and how applicable and useful they are at the Villa and in achieving the objects of this thesis. 3.3 covers work which has been done on the roles and value of water features in dwellings. 3.4 reviews existing research on the decoration of water features. 3.5 proposes and explains the new classification of Villa water features which will be used in Chapters 4-7 and the way discussion of their decoration has been approached in Chapters 8 and 9.

Chapters 4-7 analyse the architecture of the water features at the Villa according to my classification system, making comparisons with other Roman decorative water features generally, and considering the evidence for their role in the Villa. Chapter 4

[14] Detailed critical discussion of the relevant literature is also found at appropriate points in the Catalogues and Chapters 4-10 of the main body of the thesis.

looks at four important and commonly recognised water feature types. 4.1 examines grottoes, finding that their use at the Villa is less extensive than is usually suggested and that the evidence for grotto-triclinia generally is limited. 4.2 proposes that fountain rooms played a minor role in the building of large dwellings by the second century AD. 4.3 discusses the origins and use of cavea shaped fountains. 4.4 looks at fountain walls suggesting in particular that at the Villa covered curved fountain walls indicate where other dining areas might be found and asking why there are no monumental façade fountain walls there.

Chapter 5 looks at pools. For pools outside buildings, 5.1 concludes that the large pools at the Villa show some characteristics which differ from those shown by earlier structures. 5.2 looks at pools inside buildings and suggests that the Villa pools continue to explore the decorative possibilities suggested by the atrium impluvium pools which were originally practical in function.

Chapter 6 deals with minor water features and a little explored characteristic of water feature design. 6.1 identifies block fountains as a new class, and considers its origins and connections. 6.2 looks at the way water steps were used at the Villa and previously and 6.3 at the occurrence of small, deep, walled up basins at the Villa and elsewhere.

Chapter 7 looks individually at the large complex water features of the Villa, which incorporate at least two and as many as five features which could have appeared separately. A connection between the design of the Island Enclosure (7.1) and other decorative pools with built structures is suggested. 7.2 reappraises ideas about the function of the Arcaded Triclinium based on the archaeological evidence and comparisons. 7.3 looks particularly at proposals for dining in the Stadium Garden. 7.4 deals with the Water Court, its use and the extent generally to which octagonal fountain rooms occurred. 7.5 explores, inter alia, exactly how the Scenic Triclinium and Canal might have fulfilled a dining and entertainment role.

Chapters 8 and 9 turn to the decoration of all these features and how it fits with the historical context. Chapter 8 discusses surface decoration, the way in which the point at which water exited might be elaborated with a spout or relief decoration, and water

containers at the Villa and elsewhere, noting in particular the continuing use of pumice (8.1.2), and the use of tripod fountains at the Villa (8.3.3) as compared to elsewhere.

Chapter 9 deals with fountain figures and other figure sculpture found with water features at the Villa and elsewhere. 9.1-3 looks at how sculpture was used, and what sculpture was used, in or with particular types of architectural structure – pools, niches, and grottoes - observing in particular that the contents of grottoes are not as homogeneous as sometimes suggested. 9.4-5 looks more generally at the grouping of statuary and the arrangement of statuary for views. Unresolved questions at the Villa are addressed and the groupings chosen for the Scenic Triclinium and Canal are considered in depth.

Chapter 10, the thesis Conclusions, discusses and develops the findings which have been emerging in Chapters 4-9 regarding the roles of decorative water features at the whole Villa, considering where water was used and why (10.1). 10.2 returns to the question of context, looking first at what type of villa the Villa is structurally. It enlarges on findings about how the Villa's collection of water features relate to what we know of other larger dwellings, and the smaller dwellings, which have been used as points of comparison throughout.

In the Summary at **Chapter 11** I have summarised the main findings of the thesis, and identified areas where further research would be particularly beneficial.

2. The Villa and its early history

Introduction

This Chapter sets the scene for consideration of the Hadrianic Villa, explaining when the Villa was built and what we know about it from the sources, and how it was supplied with water. The structures on the site before Hadrian are considered, and what Hadrian did with these Republican features in the Hadrianic Villa. First however, I will explain the terms used for identifying the different parts of the Villa in the whole thesis, since these differ from those used in most accounts.

2.1 Terminology for describing the Villa

There is no standard system for describing locations within the Villa, neither buildings nor groups of buildings, nor the individual rooms within them. However the scale of the site (Fig.1) makes the use of a clear set of terms imperative to avoid confusion.

The most popular names for the principal features (indicated in the second column of Fig.2) derive mainly from those used by Ligorio in writing the first detailed modern account of the Villa in the sixteenth century. Partly these in their turn derive from the passage in the fourth century *Historia Augusta* which gives names apparently used in antiquity for some parts of the Villa (Lyceum, Accademia etc). Other names derive from some real or imagined feature of the surviving remains (Piazza d'Oro, Cento Camerelle, Greek and Latin Libraries etc).

These popular names are often inaccurate (the Biblioteche are not in fact libraries and the Teatro Marittimo is not a theatre) or uninformative (Sala dei Filosofi, Roccabruna). It is rarely obvious or certain which areas the names in the *Historia Augusta* applied to. MacDonald and Pinto 1995 have elected to adopt[1] carefully chosen[2] new names in their recent and wide ranging work on the Villa (Fig.2 for a list and cross-references to

---

[1] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 3: 'A fresh view has been sought, and in that spirit some traditional building names, inappropriate today, have been abandoned'.

[2] 'Carefully' is the key word. For example they replace 'gli Inferi' and similar with the 'Underground Galleries' which is concise, informative, and objective. Salza Prina Ricotti instead chooses 'Il Grande Trapezio' – but is the Trapezio a solid shape or a framework, is there a Piccolo Trapezio somewhere?

the old names). Nonetheless the old names remain popular[3] in academic works and it was not a light decision to use the new names in this thesis. However in many cases the old names, charming as they may be, serve to obscure the true nature and function of the buildings and are worse than unhelpful. I have added the old name in brackets periodically, recognising that we are in, hopefully, a transitional period.

Within the building or building complexes one also needs to be able to identify individual rooms. Again there is no standard system for the Villa though the system adopted by individual authors is usually based on a short contraction of the popular building name (for example Piazza d'Oro = PO) plus a number (PO35).[4] PO35 in De Franceschini 1991 however will not necessarily equate to PO35 in Guidobaldi 1994, and so on. Generally I have used the De Franceschini 1991 numbering system, because she covers the largest area of the Villa.

2.2 The ancient history of Hadrian's Villa

The earliest brick stamps[5] found at the Villa date from 117. Although we cannot usually tell when a brick was used rather than when it was stamped, it seems probable that Hadrian began building here after he became emperor (117) and returned to Rome (118). The most frequently recurring date for a stamp, by far, is 123.[6] During the last 60 years proposals for the sequence and dates of the buildings of the Hadrianic Villa have been based on these stamps, internal building evidence[7] and arguments based on functional requirements.[8] Attempts have been made to tie building activity in some

---

[3] They have the virtue of familiarity, at least to existing scholars (Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 80). Packer 1998 593 is also critical for this reason. I do not share Salza Prina Ricotti's view that it is presumptuous to change them (279 n.609), indeed she chooses to change one name herself (n.2 above).

[4] Packer 1998 582 in his useful critique of the books on the Villa by MacDonald and Pinto 1995, De Franceschini 1991 and Guidobaldi 1994 adopts yet another set of semi-abbreviated names. Many of these take some thinking about or indeed pronouncing (3Esed?); some have neither the virtues of clarity nor brevity. For example TeatGr for a theatre which is not Greek in style, compared to MacDonald and Pinto 1995 North Theatre.

[5] Bloch 1947 117-183.

[6] Salza Prina Ricotti 1992 Fig.2 shows the distribution graphically. Neither the frequency nor geographical distribution of brick stamps is however conclusive as to chronology. Some buildings, almost reduced to ground level, do not preserve brick stamps. Hundreds of stamps have been collected without provenance. Some bricks were re-used. Some are not datable or disputed. Stamped bricks did not have to be used by any particular date or in any particular order – depending on storage practice, newer bricks might have been used before older and bricks dated 123 may not have been used for some years.

[7] The relationship of walls, for example, rather than changes in building techniques. Given the short period of activity at the Villa, techniques do not show measurable change.

[8] For example, that the minimum requirements for a habitable Imperial residence included baths and reception rooms.

way to Hadrian's presence in Italy. This can lead to an unspoken and groundless assumption that phases were planned to finish in time for Hadrian's return from abroad. In fact Hadrian probably had an unclear idea, when he set out, of when exactly he would return, and once away, adjusted his plans as he went. The key issues remain whether the whole thing was planned from the outset, and whether distinct building 'phases' can be identified.[9]

The issues raised are complex and cannot be discussed in detail here. My own view is that the boundaries of the extensive area occupied by the Villa, including open ground as well as built up and landscaped areas, would have been established early and were partly suggested by topography and existing roads. A supply of pozzolana, and the water supply, came from the south end of the area, while buildings existed already at the north end. No traces of pre-existing buildings have been found south of the Residence. Any significant work at the north end therefore required routes (aqueducts and roads) to bring supplies from the south. It was not necessary for the architect to decide at the outset exactly how much, and how, the intervening spaces were to be developed. Hadrian's presence, or imminent arrival, might well be the stimulus for more frenzied activity and his presence on site would almost certainly lead to changes of plan or new plans. Yet even an Emperor could not always lay his hands immediately on costly imported materials, or command the acceleration of a building process that, say, required drying out before the next stage. Conversely it would be ridiculous to think that the Emperor could not have ideas, make decisions or send orders about a project he was very familiar with while away from home, or that activity was totally suspended because he was away. I think therefore that the development of the Villa could have been, and is more likely to have been, the product of an organic and flexible approach with new elements being added before earlier ideas were fully complete, rather than the predetermined outcome of a phased project with only minor changes en route. The brick stamps do suggest a particular flurry of building work in the mid to late 120s.[10]

---

[9] The phasing proposals of Bloch 1947 are summarised at 182-183. Salza Prina Ricotti 1992 presents a series of plans based on three Hadrianic phases. Guidobaldi 1994 3ff tends to favour two phases.
[10] Even those in favour of phasing admit there must have been some changes of plan as work progressed. Those in favour of a more organic development include Giuliani 1988 86 and De Franceschini 1991 631.

The period of time Hadrian actually spent at the Villa during his twenty-one year reign was limited by his travelling and the continuing importance of time spent in Rome.[11] He did not return to Italy after his accession until about June 118[12] and left again in spring 121.[13] During this period we know of a trip to Campania, and he must have spent substantial periods in Rome itself. The Villa itself may not have been fit for occupation by the imperial court for most or all of this period. He left Italy in spring 121, returning 125.[14] In August or September 125 he wrote a letter from the Villa to Delphi.[15] For 127 we know both that he was in Rome and undertook an Italian tour.[16] He left Italy in 128 and apart from one brief return visit also in 128,[17] was away until 134.[18] He had a haemorrhage at the Villa towards the end of his life but actually died at Baiae in 138.[19]

Hadrian will have inherited imperial property in Rome and elsewhere as well as his own and Sabina's family property. Ownership and usage[20] are not synonymous but Hadrian is known to have been at (presumably imperial) property in Campania in 119, and at his death. Buildings in the Horti Sallustiani and the Domus Flavia in Rome show clear signs of substantial Hadrianic work.[21] Nonetheless the fame of this Villa lingered long after his death and the building remained 'Hadrian's' Villa in the ancient sources.[22]

---

[11] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 19, 11.5 years Rome or Tivoli; Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 25, 12 years 'a Roma'. I believe the time he spent at the Villa was likely to be much less than 11 years given the initial period when it was unfit for occupation, his obligations in Rome itself, and his visits to other parts of Italy.

[12] Birley 1997 77-93 on his movements prior to his return to Rome. Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 24 interprets the *SHA* as indicating a brief visit to Rome in 117, not a common view.

[13] Birley 1997 113 on the date evidence.

[14] Birley 1997 113 and 189.

[15] The significance of this was first recognised by Bloch 1947 158.

[16] Evidence Birley 1997 97.

[17] *SHA* 13.6.

[18] The view of Birley and others – MacDonald and Pinto 1995 18 (and notes) following Halfmann put the arrival back in Rome two years earlier.

[19] *SHA* 23.7; 25.5.

[20] Hirschfeld 1913 526ff remains the most accessible account of Imperial property in Rome and Italy; Leppert 1974, an unpublished dissertation, is selective. Philostratus' comment (*Life of Apollonius* 8.20) that Hadrian's villa at Antium was the palace the emperor liked most is curious considering the huge expense and labour of the Tivoli Villa.

[21] For a summary of constructions in the Horti Sallustiani see Boatwright 1987 155ff; for the installation of central heating in the dining room of the Domus Flavia see Gibson et al. 1994 72-73 and for other changes Boatwright 1987 152f. For Hadrianic work in the Vigna Barberini area of the Palatine see summary in Vigna Barberini 2001 65ff.

[22] In this way the Villa has very much fulfilled the function of commemorating its builder in the sense discussed by Bodel 1997.

The lengthiest ancient reference to the Villa is in Hadrian's biography in the fourth century *Historia Augusta* which tells us

> Tiburtam Villam mire exaedificavit, ita ut in ea et provinciarum et locorum celeberrima nomina inscriberet, velut Lyceum, Academian, Prytaneum, Canopum, Poicilen, Tempe vocaret et, ut nihil praetermitteret, etiam inferos finxit.
>
> [Hadrian] fashioned the Tiburtine Villa marvellously, in such a way that he might inscribe there the names of provinces and places most famous and could call [certain parts], for instance, the Lyceum, the Academy, the Prytaneum, Canopus, the Poecile, the [Vale of] Tempe. And, in order to omit nothing, he even made an underworld.[23]

Debate continues about which of these names relate to what parts of the Villa (if the *SHA* report is indeed correct).[24] There was nothing novel about fanciful nomenclature in private Roman dwellings, intended to conjure up images and suggestions by association. The significance of these names can often only be guessed at.[25] They also, in my view, probably served as navigational aids – addresses, in our terms. In a place as huge and irregularly laid out as the Villa, some sort of agreed terminology for giving directions, describing meeting places and so on, was essential, and still is today. Modern writers require about 50 different names and these often cover complexes of dozens of rooms (Fig.2). Every major location in the Villa, not just a few special places, must have had a name – though perhaps often of a more prosaic nature, distinguishing areas maybe by size, shape, decoration, orientation, season of use and so on.[26]

---

[23] SHA *Hadr.* 26.5. Translation MacDonald and Pinto 1995 7.
[24] See for example the account in MacDonald and Pinto 1995 7. The reference to 'inscribing' names is unexplained too; MacDonald and Pinto 1995 151 suggests the reference is to statue bases, but I wonder about a painted or inscribed map.
[25] Atticus had his Amaltheum (*Ad Att.*1.1.6); Cicero both a Lyceum and an Academy (Marvin 1989 especially 29-32 on the relationship of the Ciceronian Academy to the Athenian); Augustus his Syracuse (Suetonius *Aug.* 72.2). Claudius took refuge in a diaeta called Hermaeum (Suetonius *Claud.* 10.1). Pertinax was assassinated in an area of the Domus Flavia called Sicilia, near the Coenatio Jovis (*SHA* Pertinax 11). Kuttner 1999 n.10 gives some further examples. In a more public context the precise function and architecture of the 'Athenaeum' as founded by Hadrian in Rome is not conveyed to us by its name (Boatwright 1987 207 with bibliography). These allusive titles also occurred in the Hellenistic palaces (Nielsen 1994 Cat.20 for example, on a Maiandros – normally taken as a reference to a kind of canal recalling the river Maeander – at the Ptolemaic palace at Alexandria).
[26] Plutarch *Lucullus* 41.4-6 illustrates that each of Lucullus' dining rooms had a name ('the Apollo' etc).

We know that Hadrian was passionate about hunting[27] and provided sophisticated entertainment for his banquet guests.[28] He actively enjoyed literature, music and the arts.[29] We can expect all these interests to have influenced the life he led at the Villa, where it is inconceivable that there was no library. His practical skills in geometry, arithmetic and architecture[30] will have played their part in the concept and execution of the Villa architecture. The Delphi letter illustrates the operation of the Villa as place of business as well as leisure.

There is no evidence that the Villa was enlarged after Hadrian's death, and the only later building work was maintenance or mundane.[31] A very small number of post Hadrianic brick stamps testify to restorations as late as the early fourth century. A series of Antonine and Severan portrait busts has survived.[32] Otherwise we hear nothing of anyone using it. At some point the Villa began to be stripped of its remaining valuable materials, perhaps by the owners,[33] and later by scavengers in search of marble for the limekilns, metals, stone and brick for recycling.

Over the last ten years an argument based on the occurrence of lead in the soil at the Villa has been used to support theories about the length of time for which certain parts of the Villa were occupied, and the type of occupation/use.[34] This argument is particularly relevant to this thesis because it is used to support a Republican date for the Fountain wall adjoining the Small Baths (Cat.1 H13) and it is discussed in greater detail in the Catalogue entry. I do not believe the scientific data has been presented completely nor all alternative explanations ruled out – the true usefulness of soil

---

[27] *SHA* 2.1; 20.12-13; 26.3. Dio *Epitome* 69.7.3; 69.10.
[28] *SHA* 26.4.
[29] *SHA* 14.8-9; 15.10-11; 16.6-11; Dio *Epitome* 69.3.1; 69.4.6. A more hostile interpretation of the leisure aspects of life at the Villa is that of Aurelius Victor 14.6
[30] *SHA* 14.8. Dio Epitome 69.4 on disagreements with the architect Apollodorus.
[31] For proposals that the Large Baths were never in fact finished, that the Southern Ruins were abandoned soon after Sabina's death, and that the bridge platform in the Scenic Triclinium was a later addition see Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 177ff, 70 and 250 respectively.
[32] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 198-199 and footnotes for details on brick stamps and portraits. Lugli 1932 is the only substantial attempt to identify post-Hadrianic wall work, mostly repairs and terracing/buttressing.
[33] The interior of the Scenic Canal was certainly stripped thoroughly before the statuary found in the 1950s fell in but when this happened is not known. For various hypotheses about the pillaging of materials by Caracalla and Constantine see Guidobaldi 1994 6 and n.29.
[34] The most complete rehearsal of the arguments is at Salza Prina Ricotti 1994b, also Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 69-75; these contain previous references.

sample evidence, and the best scientific process for interpreting it will become clearer as further work is done at this and other sites.

2.3 The water supply of the Villa

It is usually assumed that, in addition to collecting rainwater in cisterns, and tapping whatever local springs were then available, the occupants of the Villa also drew water by a spur from one of the four aqueducts (Marcia, Claudia, Anio Vetus and Anio Novus) running along the upper contours of Monte Ripoli, a kilometre or two away to the east.[35] However no such junction with the main aqueduct has yet been identified.[36] Three stretches of local aqueduct, possibly four, have certainly been identified closer to the main Villa.[37]

The first is a 45m stretch with 8 remaining piers (16 seen by Piranesi).[38] It enters the Villa on the east, crossing the East (Tempe) Valley, heading in the direction of the Scenic Triclinium and Canal. Its full course within the Villa (which must have been mostly if not entirely underground) has not been traced. The source could either be local, on the slopes of Monte Ripoli, or there might have been a connection to a main aqueduct.[39]

The second is a 17 pier/16 arch stretch, bending slightly in the middle, which according to Piranesi ran broadly south-north heading in the direction of the southeast corner of the Underground Galleries. Nothing of this is now visible because of the extensive pozzolana quarrying in the area.[40]

---

[35] For example MacDonald and Pinto 1995 26 favours the Anio Novus.
[36] Van Deman 1934 40 and Ashby 1935 64 describe one possible branch from the Anio Vetus (destroyed) but Van Deman says it was 'of a late period'. Lanciani 1980 273 notes Hadrianic inscriptions from 4 pipes, but it is not clear whether his assertion that there was a link near the Villa of Brutus is hypothesis or based on observation. Manderscheid 2000a 113-115 offers further discussion of the evidence (without reference to the evidence of Piranesi) and indicates that Jorgen Hansen (Copenhagen) is undertaking research.
[37] Unfortunately no modern map or plan shows all clearly. On Mari 1991's map of the area three are signalled at 84, 150 and 152, which correspond to Piranesi F 1781 Ergastulo e Crittoportico 13 and Liceo 13 and 9. The MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Sketch Plan (Fig.1) shows the location of the second and third stretches described here, to the right of the Underground Galleries.
[38] Piranesi F 1781 Plate 3; text Plate 6 Ergastulo e Crittoportico 13.
[39] Mari 1991 No. 84 gives a full description of the surviving portions of this stretch.
[40] Mari 1991 No.150. Piranesi F 1781 Plate 4; text Plate 6 Liceo 13

Thirdly, lengthy stretches are still visible beyond the Southern Range (Accademia)[41] running broadly south-north but again the origins and connections of this water channel are not clear. Mari 1991 believes that its incoming course cannot be traced beyond the point where it reaches the Southernmost Ruins (Liceo) and that these Ruins were part of a large establishment quite separate from the Villa.[42] He thinks the source for this water must lie on the hill of S.Stefano since the drop for a feed from the main aqueducts would not be practical at this point.[43] Piranesi believed the aqueduct did continue to connect with the western extremity of the 'ambulatory wall.[44] Salza Prina Ricotti on the other hand believes that this stretch connects at right angles with a channel running parallel to the ambulatory wall (still part of the Villa) which in turn connects with a source named the Aqua Ferrata.[45] She links the poor quality of this water to red staining seen in the large underground (settlement) tank linked to the Large and Small Baths and says it explains the extensive use of rainwater tanks and cisterns in the Villa.[46] Mari 1991 says there is no archaeological evidence for a connection between the extant aqueduct and the source (and none is shown by Piranesi F 1781).[47]

Finally (and possibly fourthly), Salza Prina Ricotti supports Piranesi's report of an aqueduct branch running east-west and parallel to the south short end of the Underground Galleries which must have come from one of the aqueducts.[48] This purer water would presumably dilute the iron bearing water she proposes and so this element of her argument is not wholly consistent.[49]

---

[41] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig 13, and Penna 1831-36 II No.117 reproduced at MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig 225. Mari 1991 gives a detailed description at No. 152.
[42] Mari 1991 No.153 and contemporaneous with the Villa, from the brick stamps. Salza Prina Ricotti and MacDonald and Pinto 1995 believe these Ruins were part of the Villa, including a double ambulatory wall (matching that of the East West Terrace); Mari 1991 is not convinced that there was such a wall.
[43] No. 152 233.
[44] This short stretch is shown on Piranesi F 1781 Plate 4, Text Plate 6 Liceo 8.
[45] For example Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 Fig 13 shows the source E and then the canalisation and aqueduct as M. Mari 1991 shows the source at H on Fig 373 defined at 234 as 'una sorgente di acqua ferruginosa'.
[46] Salza Prina Ricotti 1982 43f.
[47] Mari 1991 233 n.661.
[48] Salza Prina Ricotti 1982 Tav. V F and 32; Salza Prina Ricotti 1973b Tav. 1, also Piranesi F 1781 Plate 4, Liceo 10, text Plate 6.
[49] Also, unfortunately, the meaning of the symbols (various types of lines) used in the plan at Salza Prina Ricotti 1973b Tav. 1 is not given in the text or the legend to the plan. There is very little discussion in the text, so that what she saw, and what she intended to convey about canalisations in the whole area, is not clear.

So the piped water sources for the Villa are not yet fully understood, nor have all the details of the branching distribution system which clearly existed within the Villa boundaries been plotted yet.[50] Better knowledge of these might indicate unidentified water features or resolve some of the open questions about the known features (see Cat.1 Explanatory note). Some of the detailed distribution systems within the larger structures are known and are discussed in the Catalogue.

I am not aware of any ancient wells at the Villa but cisterns appear frequently.[51] Some of these are very likely to have been used to store not just imported water but also the considerable quantities of water collected at times from the roofs of the Villa, which had to be channelled and disposed of somehow. Cisterns exist within or by the vast majority of decorative water features, as detailed in the Catalogue 1 entries. In these locations it is probable that they served not just as general water collection points but to provide a specific supply when and if the running water supply was cut off, perhaps to store water up overnight for use during the day, and perhaps to create greater pressure for decorative effects.[52]

As regards disposal of waste water, again the full details have not been plotted though it is evident that there were discharges on the east side in the area below the Water Court (Piazza d'Oro) and there must have been something similar on the west side below the East West Terrace. These discharges would connect with the streams running through the valleys on each side. The Bog (Pantanello) may also have been created or fed by wastewater from the Villa.

2.4 How many villas before Hadrian?

The existence of pre-Hadrianic structures on site had already been noted in passing and Lugli 1927, passim, was the first scholar to identify clearly the remains of earlier

---

[50] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 27 (notes) wonder whether the Platform Structure housed the Villa water distribution and administration centre because the plan and structure of the north west parts resemble the Anio Novus reservoir – however the water coming in from the Southern Ruins is unlikely to have been diverted all the way east to the Platform Structure when it could flow more directly to areas of need on the west.

[51] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 172 counts 10 but cannot be counting all the tanks linked with individual water features.

[52] Similar cisterns occur with public baths theoretically fed by continuous supply aqueducts (Manderscheid 2000b 490f). The water supply for the Colosseum was probably managed in the same way (Gabucci 1999 233). Manderscheid 2000a 117-118 also comments on the occurrence and function of such cisterns.

structures. Although not everyone has agreed with his identification or dating or interpretation of all these remains,[53] his conclusion that there was a substantial earlier villa on the site (here called Republican villa 1) is not disputed. Republican villa 1 roughly occupied the area of the Residence, and dated from the Republic, with several phases evident. The detailed chronology does not concern us here.[54] Water features Cat.1 R3, 4 and 5 (see Fig.3) fall within the area clearly occupied by Republican villa 1.

What is not often recognised is that there was almost certainly more than one Republican villa.[55] Tivoli and the surrounding areas were thickly clustered with such villas, so this is not very surprising.[56] Fig.3 shows the scattered distribution of Republican water features over the area of the Hadrianic Villa. The evidence for the existence of more than one Republican villa is, firstly, the structures in the platform of the Doric Temple terrace, including the fountain room (see Cat.1 R1). The distance from Republican villa 1 – about 250m direct – and the fact that it seems to have been part of another platform structure, strongly suggests it was a separate property, Republican villa 2.[57] Another Republican water feature (Cat.1 R6) again over 200m away, as the crow flies, from the apparent edge of Republican villa 1, suggests another villa, 3. Republican villas 2 and 3 are at a lower level than villa 1[58] and appear to have been on the other side of the Republican road which was swallowed up by the Villa and incorporated in its own transport network. This separating road again suggests that they were most likely separate properties.[59]

---

[53] See for example Catalogue 1 exclusion 11 for the structure identified by Lugli as an Augustan 'ninfeo' adjoining the Island Enclosure, which most now agree is a Hadrianic feature with no water connection. A recent review of the evidence by Da Milano et al. 1992 has however broadly accepted Lugli's dating conclusions (and also his dubious identification of several structures as 'ninfei').

[54] For example whether the 'original' Villa dates back to the 2nd century BC (Adriano 2000 45) or the 1st century BC (Lugli 1927 summary 199) or even apparently the early 3rd century BC (occupation 400 years before Hadrian according to Salza Prina Ricotti 1994b 76, with no explanation given for driving back the date).

[55] For example MacDonald and Pinto 1995 176 accepts that the Fountain room behind the Water Court (Cat.1 R6) is Republican but does not address the question of how it was related to Republican villa 1. Salza Prina Ricotti 1973b 227 recognises Republican origins for the cryptoporticus under the Doric Temple without considering the implications.

[56] See Neuerburg 1968 for an outline of some of the major villas; Quilici 1967 and the four Tibur volumes of the Forma Italiae, for more details.

[57] Lugli 1932 114 first identified it as pre-Hadrianic and maybe separate from the Residence construction.

[58] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Sketch Plan (Fig.1) with contour markings or Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 Fig 12 for axonometric drawing.

[59] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 85 for the course of the Republican road.

The last remaining Republican water feature included in the Catalogue, the Cistern fountain (Cat.1 R2) is more problematic. The Republican dating is not absolutely certain either on grounds of technique or design. The facade is not built into the Hadrianic terrace wall but set at an angle to it (Fig.7). It is unlikely that this was accidental so why? It could be because the fountain, though built around the time of the terrace wall, was oriented to conclude a view for someone emerging from the Doric Temple. On this reading, people leaving the Doric Temple and heading back to the Residence area would follow a short path punctuated by fountains for approximately 50m, turning to the left or right of the cistern fountain to ascend to the next terrace level.[60] Alternatively, the curious angle could be because the cistern fountain predates the wall, and the Doric Temple, and is another relic of a pre-existing villa, probably Republican villa 1. Although located alongside the Republican road (on the Hadrian's Villa side), the cistern fountain was some metres higher, so it was unlikely that it was for public use and refreshment, yet odd to have a private structure so close to a public road. The date of the cistern fountain remains uncertain but for these and the reasons given in the Catalogue entry, I favour a pre-Hadrianic date.

There are no particular grounds for thinking that Republican villas 1, 2, or 3 were ancestral property of Hadrian's family, or Sabina's, although a man in the position of Hadrian's father might be expected to live in Rome but have a country property elsewhere.[61] Salza Prina Ricotti has attempted to bolster the suggestion that there was family property here by arguing that the structure called by MacDonald and Pinto 1995 the Park Rotunda is firstly a tomb and secondly Republican.[62] The 'tomb' is within the Villa area (Fig.1 36) and she argues that it would be unthinkable for another family to exercise their legal right to access a family tomb on imperial property – therefore

---

[60] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 176: 'From the Doric Temple, which the nymphaeum [cistern fountain] faced across the terrace, the water would seem to have been forced from the looming mass behind'. However the surrounding portico would obstruct the view from the Temple itself. There would only be a view on emerging from the buildings. Linking fountains between cistern and opposing buildings are shown in the Gismondi model of the Villa, for which see Ortolani 1998 Fig 16.7

[61] Birley 1997 13. Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 65 for example favours Hadrian's family; Coarelli 1982 49, Sabina's. This family sentiment/existing property argument is often advanced as an explanation of why Hadrian chose for his Villa a site so lacking the spectacular natural features that figure in other villas. Again, the reasons for his choice need not concern us here, but MacDonald and Pinto 1995 26-27 is a neat summary of differing views. Syme 1982 for Spanish ownership of, or connection to, property around Tivoli.

[62] Most recently at Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 67, though at Salza Prina Ricotti 1973b 235 n.1 she was of the view that the 'tomb' was Hadrianic.

the tomb must be an imperial family tomb, on ancestral property.[63] However a spur from the underground road to the tomb did make controlled access to the 'tomb' possible,[64] without passing through the main parts of the Villa. These days the structure is reduced to its core and the best evidence for its original appearance is a Penna 1831-36 illustration, which still does not resolve the question of function much less of date.[65] The question of whether it is a tomb and if so Republican has not been resolved and therefore it neither supports nor discredits the theory that the Hadrianic Villa incorporated existing family property.[66]

Nonetheless, one of Republican villas 1-3 might have been family property, and not necessarily Republican villa 1. It seems unlikely that all of them were, and therefore the preparatory work at the Villa would have included acquiring surrounding property in order to give more space, privacy, or sensible boundaries.[67] The location of Republican villa 1, at the heart of the high ground, and maybe its existing scale and condition, made it the most natural choice for the core of the new Hadrianic Villa, whether it, somewhere else, or nowhere in the area, was originally family property.

2.5 Expansion and amalgamation

It is not clear exactly what remained of the previous villas and was usable at the point when Hadrian began to execute his plans. Some think that Republican villa 1 was occupied continuously from its start up to the date of Hadrian's accession.[68] Lugli however pointed out that there are no real signs of post-Augustan repair and renewal and it is possible that the buildings were in a state of disrepair or unoccupied.[69] However it is too simplistic to say that the Republican fountain in the Residence Quadrangle (part of villa 1) was the only structure spared the pulling down[70] - there is, apart from anything else, the platform on which Republican villa 1 was built and many

---

[63] See Bodel 1997 generally on evidence for emotional attachment to ancestral properties and 20-26 especially on the phenomenon of monumental tombs on villa properties.
[64] As the author herself notes at Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 69 n.147.
[65] Penna 1831-36 II No. 125 reproduced conveniently at MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig 150.
[66] Salza Prina Ricotti does not advance any technical arguments; MacDonald and Pinto 1995 121-122 for the agnostic view.
[67] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 73 n.158 for 'altri proprietari'.
[68] Adriano 2000 45; the periods of time given in Salza Prina Ricotti 1994b for total occupation of the Villa site imply continuous occupation.
[69] Lugli 1928 200 summary.
[70] Rakob 1973 122.

other fragments of walls in its area.[71] On the other hand the structure on the Hadrianic Fountain Court Terrace was evidently practically razed to the ground.[72] So different structures were dealt with differently and the question here is whether there is anything significant in the way the decorative water features were treated.[73]

We understand, or can imagine, the rationale for the preservation or demolition of existing buildings in only a few cases and most of these relate to the city of Rome where conditions, in all ways, were rather different from those that related to villas in the country. The area occupied by the Domus Aurea was turned by and large to other uses both because the Flavians and their successors had no wish to associate themselves with their predecessor, and because they had other uses for the valuable land. It was not necessary to tear everything down though, so we can still deduce the features of a large tract, including water features, of the Esquiline wing and the structures under the Flavian constructions on the Palatine, because they remained in place and in use - not as they were, but as substructures and foundations. The Domus Aurea itself made substantial use of pre-existing structures.[74] Occasionally, in the country, as at the so-called Villa of Brutus at Tivoli, where again a remarkable number of water features are evident (five), older features were buried behind new construction but new ones were added too. This villa, with features apparently dating from the 2nd century BC through to the end of the 1st century AD, would provide an interesting comparison for Hadrian's Villa but sadly it has never been properly explored and published.[75] The relationship of the Domitianic features at Castel Gandolfo to the Ninfeo Dorico, dating from the 1st century BC, has never been fully explained;[76] similarly Domitian's villa at Circeo, only small parts of which have been explored in detail, incorporated Republican elements.[77] It is evident though from a cursory glance

---

[71] Most recently reviewed by Da Milano et al. 1992 but not including the Fountain Court Terrace structures or any outside 'Republican villa 1'.
[72] See Cat.1 H2 n.33.
[73] The hypothesis in Da Milano et al. 1992 85, that the reason Hadrian used some of the remains and much of the plan of Republican villa 1 was that he began work with more limited means before he became emperor, is superficially attractive but does not explain the retention of the other water features which were kept and worked in with later constructions.
[74] Ball 1994 185ff.
[75] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.209, 2nd century BC, buried behind and superseded by a later façade; Cat.207 added in front of earlier constructions, maybe end 1st century AD; also Neuerburg 1965 Cat.205, 206, 208. To Neuerburg 1965's bibliography add Neuerburg 1968 289 and Mari 1991 No. 224 (Letzner 1999 adds no new detail).
[76] Lugli (1913 89ff) certainly believed the older building fell within the area of Domitian's villa, but it is about 1km from the Ninfeo Bergantino and 200m from the port and landing area. I am not aware of any further reports of Republican structures in the area.
[77] Lugli 1928 contains the most through review of the whole complex.

at general catalogues of Roman villas – for example Romizzi 2001 – that in the early imperial period, villas regularly (normally?) incorporated elements of earlier constructions. A more thorough consideration of the phenomenon generally – of the how and why - is hampered by the usual difficulties: destruction or covering of other earlier material by rebuilding, poor excavation, and poor publication.[78]

Sometimes older properties did have value because of their associations – thus there is evidence that the house of Augustus on the Palatine was deliberately preserved for some time with its furnishings[79] and Seneca visiting the country villa of Scipio Africanus took the opportunity to contrast its simplicity and plainness with modern excesses.[80] The point here is that somehow the property had survived 200 years in a recognisably 'old fashioned' style, and retained its association with its famous previous owner. This brings us back to the question of whether Hadrian or Sabina had associations with any of the older parts of the structure, without being any further towards resolving it.

While water features from perhaps three previous villas were retained in the new Villa (and for two of these villas, very little else is preserved) they were not, by and large, kept as they were and especially not those in more central locations.

The Fountain Room in the Residence Quadrangle (Cat.1 R3) kept its shape but very probably lost its water function and was completely redecorated including the addition of a pedestal. There does not seem to be any evidence of the religious use sometimes suggested.[81] However any statue would block the view of the main niche and considerably limit the small space available for setting up, for example, dining couches. The use of opus sectile in (walls and floor) and around this room indicates that the area retained a high status in the hierarchy of Hadrianic Villa structures, and

---

[78] Bodel 1997 11ff summarises what we know of the process by which, and the extent to which, property was handed down the generations and Roman attitudes to 'ancestral' property. He is not so much concerned with what later owners did with the older buildings, though at 13 he cites one example of the apparently careful preservation of an old floor.
[79] Tamm 1963 49 and n.37. It is not absolutely clear archaeologically or from Suetonius that the house was still standing in Suetonius' time.
[80] *Ep.* 86.
[81] Lugli 1927 153 - a 'tempietto' when the base was added, with a statue to a rural deity (no evidence for rural deity). Neuerburg 1965 is of the view that there was a change of use, marked by the pedestal, in the Antonine period. Guidobaldi 1994 BB18 90 'sacello'. Giuliani 1999 72 says, without substantiation, that the structure became a kind of 'sacello' but also suggests that a water function continued while admitting that the way it worked is not clear.

the title 'Residence' indicates the generally accepted view that this whole area was one of the more private quarters, even if perhaps only pending the construction of alternative purpose-built Imperial living areas (the Island Enclosure, the Peristyle Pool building, maybe Fountain Court East and West). The retention of this single room with its simple proportions (Fig.11.1),[82] albeit in a refurbished state, off-axis in the Quadrangle, with a prominent 'porch' protruding into the garden, when all immediately around it had been taken down, or fallen down, seems to suggest more than just economy. Perhaps a personal attachment to the 'old villa', perhaps work had begun here (in an economic fashion) prior to Hadrian's accession.[83] Perhaps Hadrian was interested in the unusual shape of the old vault.[84] Perhaps more generally the ancient structure found its own small role to play in the almost endless variety of settings and structures and atmospheres being created within the new Hadrianic Villa, as a recognisably 'old fashioned' room.

The structure in the Republican cryptoporticus (Cat.1 R4, Fig.12) suffered a different fate since the cryptoporticus itself seems to have been partitioned and lost its ambulatory function in the new Villa, though the fountain itself and the ancient mosaic on the ceiling did not become inaccessible. However the lack of new decoration, and the partitioning, suggests that no great interest was taken in the old structure and no great value ascribed to it.

The third and final remnant of the water features of Republican villa 1, which became the Fountain in the east corner of the Residence (Cat.1 R5, Fig.15),[85] was under Hadrian the terminus of a monumental enclosure with two other major elements (open courtyard and imposing semi-domed entrance block, Fig.13). Here we seem to see the economical reuse of what was there but in pursuit of a large modern design.

Turning to the water features which may well have begun life in the other Republican villas, at the Doric Temple (Cat.1 R1) the features in the Republican cryptoporticus there appear to have suffered a similar fate to the feature in the Residence cryptoporticus – neglected, blocked, not re-decorated, not treated as important, but not

---

[82] Rakob 1987 20 finds the room's continued enjoyment of a prominent position in the courtyard surprising given the room's 'plumpen' proportions.
[83] Giuliani 1999 67-8.
[84] See Brown 1965 for Hadrian's interest in vaults.
[85] I take the view (see 4.3.4) that the main structure predates the Hadrianic Villa, though it is not possible to be absolutely certain at that stage that water ran down it.

made entirely inaccessible.[86] The main fountain room under the Doric Temple (Fig.6.1)was again treated rather differently.[87] In the first place it was kept despite the fact that it makes the east façade strongly asymmetrical, having no pair at the south end. The upper levels of the platform with the Temple and other Hadrianic structures are absolutely symmetrical.[88] It is not easy to make out the changes wrought here by the Hadrianic architect decoratively; the only remaining material (apart from white marble pool facings) is pumice. The steps and depth of the floor make it clear that this room was used as a pool but was this pool an original part of the Republican structure or an adaptation of a Republican fountain room without such a pool? The differing wall work makes it very likely that at least the front extension – and quite possibly the lowering of the floor inside – were Hadrianic.[89] In any event, it is clear that the room, although in one of the remoter parts of the Villa, at a lower level, and looking out towards Tivoli itself was retained and maintained under the new order for some purpose. Lavagne speaks of a walk along the East Valley taking in this room and also the East Belvedere fountain room, which again stands alone at a lower level and looking out.[90] He sees here (unusually preserved) evidence for the existence of more informal promenades in the landscape within the Villa boundaries, away from the manicured formal gardens, but still interspersed with interesting or surprising structures. In this case, the fortuitous remains of an earlier structure have been used. There is further discussion of the role of this room at 4.2.4.

The difficulties surrounding the dating of the cistern fountain by the East Terrace (Cat.1 R2, Fig.8) are discussed in the catalogue entry. It may well be that here, again, the chance survival of an older feature with recognised decorative merit (that is, a water feature rather than a utilitarian structure or one of no artistic interest) led to it being kept and worked into the carefully planned paths of pleasure of the new Villa.

Finally, the relationship of the fountain room behind the Water Court (Cat.1 R6, Fig.18) to the Hadrianic Villa is very hard to ascertain in its present unexcavated state.

---

[86] Lavagne 1988 596-598 takes a more positive view of the deliberate 'conservation' of these Republican cryptoporticus features.
[87] Lavagne 1988 598 seems to regard this room as somehow superseding the other features, yet it too is Republican so for a long time it would have co-existed with them.
[88] The Gismondi model (Ortolani 1998 Fig 16) is incorrect in this respect and also does not show the asymmetrical cryptoporticus access.
[89] Ortolani 1998 25 also appears to be of the view that there was a fountain room 'trasformato in natatio'.
[90] Lavagne 1988 598.

The room itself does not appear to have undergone any Hadrianic transformation (though the floor is not visible) but there are signs of Hadrianic construction around. What purpose these other constructions served is, again, not clear. The apparent removal of the panels may have taken place in antiquity or in modern, antiquity-hunting, times. In any event, the room is well off the beaten track in Villa terms and its role can only have been a subsidiary one.

Conclusions

In this Chapter I have looked briefly at the Villa building project and the limited information available about how the Villa was supplied with water, an area which merits further research. I identified evidence for there being at least one and very possibly 3 villas, or the remains of them, on the site when Hadrian began work and noted that several of their water features were maintained and incorporated, in different ways, within the Hadrianic Villa, possibly for family reasons, possibly for their structural interest – the whole question of why later builders kept older structures, or parts of them, is one which could reward study across a much wider range of buildings where there are several building phases.

3. Previous research on decorative water features

Introduction

In this Chapter research on decorative water features, so far as it is relevant to the structures from Hadrian's Villa, is summarised and reviewed critically in order in particular to develop a classification system for the structures which will assist in achieving the objects of this thesis. I have concentrated here on literature which is general in nature or deals with sites outside the Villa; the Villa monographs and other in depth surveys of parts of the Villa are considered at appropriate points in the thesis, particularly Chapters 4-7 and the Catalogues in the Appendix.

3.1 The literary and epigraphic evidence

In the mid to late 20th century a debate developed over what the Romans meant by certain terms – in particular nymphaeum and musaeum[1] - in the context of water features, with discussion led by Lugli 1938, Mingazzini 1957, Neuerburg 1965, Settis 1968 and Settis 1973 (each referencing considerable additional bibliography). Typologies were developed partially incorporating what was understood by these terms.[2] In fact there is no positive evidence from the written sources that Romans applied either of these terms up to Hadrian's time, or indeed thereafter, to the private architectural structures in their possession. There is evidence that the term nymphaeum was applied first to natural grottoes and later to monumental public building,[3] but at Rome the emergence of the forms of monumental public fountains seems to precede the application of the term nymphaeum to them.[4] In modern usage nymphaeum has translated into the Italian ninfeo, and ninfeo is used very broadly indeed, and often vaguely, without any clarification of what is meant.[5]

---

[1] Nymphaeum appears in a number of different contexts. Musaeum is used by Pliny the Elder at *NH* 36.154 as the name given by Greeks to rooms with pumice on their ceilings in imitation of a cave: '..aedificiis, quae musaea vocant, dependentia ad imaginem specus arte reddendam'.
[2] These contributions are not always free from confusion. Settis 1968 for example, thinks that Neuerburg 1965 has not understood Mingazzini1957's position very clearly, but his own elucidation of Mingazzini also does not appear to reconcile what Mingazzini is saying at different points. In fact Mingazzini is not consistent in his use of terminology between the articles cited.
[3] Outlined for example by Neuerburg 1965 22f.
[4] Settis 1973 737.
[5] For example, Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 dealing with water at Ostia distinguish without defining (Preface Vol.1) pozzi, fontane, ninfei and cisterne; at no point in Volume II do they explain what the difference is between a fontana and a ninfeo (separately catalogued), and whether this is considered to be a Roman distinction or is in fact a modern one.

Thus there is no evidence for use of the term nymphaeum in a private context, and the process by which the term nymphaeum made the transition from grotto to monumental public fountain is not clear to us. Most recent commentators restrict their usage of the term accordingly[6] and I will not be using the term when talking about decorative water structures in dwellings.

Leaving aside nymphaeum and musaeum, the Romans actually had a large vocabulary at their disposal to describe what they wanted or saw or had by way of decorative water[7] although the number of texts which directly add to our knowledge of why water features were included in private dwellings, why particular designs were chosen, what functions they fulfilled and how all this changed over time, is very small indeed.[8] Sperlonga is a rare case where we can link physical remains with name and function – but in this unusual case the natural feature drove the terminology. The villa we know as Sperlonga was almost certainly the villa called Speluncae where a rock fall in a cave (spelunca) killed a number of people dining there, but not (quite) the emperor Tiberius.[9] How the occupants and visitors of the Villa actually described or regarded, for example, such a complex structure as the Water Court – and in particular whether it would have been described architecturally or fancifully or functionally - is simply not known,[10] and I concluded that approaching the structures at the Villa from the point of view of ancient terms was unlikely to prove fruitful.

Lavagne 1988 bases his broad study[11] of the concept of the grotto in Roman literature partly on terminology and partly on physical structure and it is to research on the physical structures that I turn now.

---

[6] Gros 1996 419 for example. Nonetheless remarks such as 'Roman fountain constructions in the city as well as in palace and villa architecture...were, in general, called nymphaea' still occur in some publications (Glaser 2000 437) but cannot be substantiated.

[7] For example fons (and derivatives, used repeatedly in Pliny *Ep.*5.6), piscina (also used in Pliny *Ep.*5.6), stagnum (with reference to the Domus Aurea Tacitus *Ann.* 15.42), euripus (Cicero, mockingly, *De Leg.* 2.1.1), not to mention words with cave and grotto meanings such as specus, antrum, spelunca.

[8] Pliny's letter on his Tuscan villa is the most important (*Ep.*5.6). The letter on the Laurentine villa (*Ep.*2.17) is less informative since as he freely admits, lack of a good running water supply was one of its disadvantages. The degree to which the structures Pliny described actually resembled his real villas is debated, and his descriptions are selective, (Bergmann 1995 for a summary), but the water features he describes are consistent with the archaeological evidence.

[9] Suetonius *Tib.* 39 and Tacitus *Ann.* 4.59.

[10] The ancient and modern need for some kind of agreed terminology in navigating round Hadrian's Villa and the general habit of 'naming' is discussed at 2.1 and 2.2.

[11] To which more extensive reference is made particularly in 4.1.

3.2 The archaeological evidence and typology

The first attempt at a comprehensive, architectural catalogue of Italian fountain structures is Neuerburg's immensely useful 1965 book. This catalogue was expanded by Letzner 1999's survey of the whole of the Western Empire.[12] By analysing the physical remains catalogued into broad types based mainly on plan,[13] these surveys aim inter alia to chart the development of architectural forms over time (whatever the ancients called them), identifying forms which came into use and forms which became less common. Neuerburg's 7 categories are ninfei a grotta e camere intagliate nella roccia (taken together); ninfei a camera; ninfei ad esedra semicircolare; ninfei ad edicola; ninfei rotondi and ninfei a facciata. Whether, however, Letzner 1999's greater subdivision of fountains into 20 groups, (some with as many as 5 sub-groups) provides any meaningful insights, is doubtful. Moreover both catalogues limit themselves implicitly to 'buildings' – thus pools are generally excluded. This has the curious result that at the Villa, for example, Neuerburg includes the Scenic Triclinium, but not the Canal, the south end of the Stadium Garden but not the north, the rear wall and four corner fountains at the Water Court but not the three floor pools and the canal – when common sense suggests that these locations were intended to be appreciated as a whole. Features which are only pools are excluded altogether. Farrar has attempted to fill this gap by with a typology of pools in gardens. She considers the whole Empire but the typology, based on plans only, and not incorporating or discussing factors of scale, function and context, is not very revealing.[14] For example, a pool the size of the East West Terrace pool falls under the same heading as a peristyle pool in a Pompeian garden because it is the same shape, when its effect is very different

Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 provide a detailed catalogue of water features at Ostia split between fontane (which include pools) and ninfei, and further subcategorised. However, there is virtually no discussion of the catalogue or of the different uses the different types or examples might have had.[15] George 1997 follows

---

[12] First published 1990 and somewhat updated 1999 – although the updated bibliography remains patchy – for the Villa for example the author does not cite MacDonald and Pinto 1995, any work by Salza Prina Ricotti after 1982, or Andreae and Ortega 1989.

[13] And to a lesser extent elevation and the use or not of natural features.

[14] In Farrar 1996 21-23 and Farrar 1998 71-84. She encounters particular problems with dating, not to mention the size of the geographical area and the length of the period she is attempting to summarise.

[15] For example why were fontane a bauletto covered, or, is it possible to distinguish, using their location, pools and basins which were used primarily commercially or practically, and those which were apparently not?

existing typologies and considers the occurrence of 'basins and nymphaea' as well as water features in gardens in her account of the remains of Roman houses in northern Italy. There is a wealth of evidence gathered in Jashemski 1979-1993 about the use of water in the gardens of the dwellings in Pompeii, Herculaneum and the villas around, but she is not concerned with atria pools.[16] Other authors have concentrated on particular issues relevant to water features – on the origins of apsed halls, and niche architecture.[17]

The main fountain studies do identify three main influences on the design of private fountain structures prior to Hadrian.[18] The first is the natural grotto which is used and then imitated both in terms of its curved shapes (thus vaults and, more remotely, niches) and its surface (thus natural materials especially pumice, later and more remotely mosaic).

The second influence is utilitarian fountain structures – points of water supply which, though originally covered and provided with spouts and collecting basins for practical reasons, also monumentalised and formalised the presentation of water (and water had to be presented somehow in the large private villas as much as in urban areas).[19] The influence of the grotto and the influence of the water supply point would tend to produce closed or partly closed structures.

The third influence is the theatrical scaenae frons, which is often said to be reflected particularly strongly in the multi-storey multi-niched façade fountains which, like the real stage buildings, tended to be open to the air. This issue is discussed at greater length in 4.4.

The main typologies do not consider the effect of role and context on design. The water structure tends to be extracted from its context and the question 'what was it used for?' is not addressed, sometimes to the extent of not even considering whether the structure was in a dwelling or not. So far as Hadrian's Villa is concerned, it will become clear that by this date there were previous models for virtually all the elements used in the decorative water features, and cost and space were not a factor. What was

---

[16] Similarly Grimal 1969 298ff on water in gardens.
[17] Respectively Tamm 1963 168ff and Hornbostel-Hüttner 1979 64ff.
[18] Neuerburg's analysis has stood the test of time here – summarised at the end of Neuerburg 1965 102.
[19] Glaser 1987 105ff for earlier Greek buildings, and bibliography on utilitarian structures.

driving design here was not possibility or availability or space but other factors – and typology is not much help in understanding them. Thus the Water Court and the Scenic Triclinium are allocated to Letzner 1999's Catalogue 20 'various', because taken as a whole they do not fit any of the other 19 simpler models – the basic building blocks have been used in new combinations.[20] On the other hand, there was nothing particularly second century in style about the design of the East Belvedere, the Upper Park fountain wall chamber fountain or the Park Grotto (Cat.1 H3, 19 and 20) – any of these might have been found in an earlier building. Against this background, Ehrlich's 1989 article on the Villa, setting aside the old typologies, and including pools and trying to find new ways of understanding the effects intended at the Villa, at least attempts for the first time to relate all the feature at the Villa to one another and say something more about roles.[21] This brings us to a third strand of recent research on decorative water features.

3.3 Research on roles and value

This strand of research has tended to focus on the link between water and dining locations; little has been said more generally about why water was valued and displayed in dwellings - why on arrival in the home water was not simply made available for practical purposes (washing, cooking, watering wine, watering animals, irrigation and so on) via spouts and small reservoirs.

The Romans and their admirers set store by the provision of a copious supply of good water for public use[22] but also specifically in the home. Pliny has to play down the disadvantages of the lack of running water (by which he seems to mean piped or stream water) at his Laurentine villa.[23] Having a good supply of water was in the first place a practical need and after that, and perhaps much increasing the need, came the decorative features. Cicero in discussing a new property acquired by his brother talks first of how the copious running water will enable a large area to be irrigated and second of how the house will be charming when certain 'extras' have been added –

---

[20] Letzner 1999 178-9.

[21] Though she is over reliant on counting as a signifier – moving/still water, open/covered water, single/multiple jets and so on (eg Ehrlich 1989 164, 166, n.40). Her lack of critical appraisal of identifications of fountains at the Villa by early 20th century writers, and of later writers on the Scenic Triclinium leads to inaccurate 'counts' and also accounts of the features she identifies.

[22] For example Vitr.8 *Praef* 4: 'For it is the chief requisite for life, for happiness, and for everyday use'; Strabo *Geog*. 3.5.8.

[23] *Ep*.2.17.25 'Only one thing is lacking to complete the amenities and beauty of the house – running water [aqua salienti]; but there are wells or rather springs.'

specifically a piscina, salientes, a palaestra and a wood.[24] We know a certain amount about the diversion of water from Rome's aqueducts to villas en route – costly in construction terms unless the main aqueduct was very close and presumably costly also to pay for the continuing right to draw water off, if the tap was legal.[25]

The simple pleasure taken in the play of water can be demonstrated by reference to Pliny *Ep*.5.6.23 where he cites the lovely murmuring sound of a number of small jets, and a pool with a jet which is a pleasure to see and hear. Rooms with water provide cool retreats, like shaded areas, at the height of a Mediterranean summer. By the 1st century AD, dining had become an important function associated with water. In some cases, the dining function is evident from the survival of built triclinium or biclinium couches or stibadia adjacent to water,[26] in others, the role is inferred from shape and set up.[27] The concept of the grotto-triclinium was advanced by Rakob 1964 and is discussed in detail at 4.1.4. However does the role of water go beyond providing a visually and aurally pleasant ambience? There are several other possibilities.

Larger outdoor pools could combine the keeping of fish (for the table or for decoration), or swimming, with all the attractions and cooling effect of expanses of water – these and other possible functions of large pools will be discussed in the context of the Villa at 5.1.

The terminological connection with natural haunts of the nymphs, or Muses, indicated at 3.1 above has led to a debate over whether decorative fountains later retained any residual religious or spiritual connotations. Lavagne, for example, believes they did. In Lavagne 1988,[28] by linking literary, mythological or religious images with archaeologically known 'grottoes', he emphasises the presence of the divine or at least heroic in the grotto. As indicated in 4.1 I believe his identification of structures as grottoes goes far beyond what is reasonable.

---

[24] *Ad Q.F.* 3.1.3. The Loeb edition translates piscina as fishpond (not necessarily accurately, see 5.1.2. and salientes as fountains. The letter also refers to work on the water supply of two other properties at Arcanum (line 1), and 'Bobilius' place' (line 3) where an aqueduct is proposed and costs discussed.
[25] Wilson 1999 315ff.
[26] Instances too numerous to mention at Pompeii, but for example Pompeii II 4 (House of Julia Felix). Research into Pompeian garden triclinia is outlined at Dunbabin 1991 124-125 especially footnotes. Andersson 1990 n.96 counts water between the couches in about ¼ of the examples; cases with adjacent or visible water would need to be added.
[27] For example Salza Prina Ricotti 1979 133ff on the argument for the location of dining couches on the Sperlonga cavern island.
[28] And also Lavagne 1990 134 second column.

One can neither prove nor disprove, in the final analysis, whether Romans felt at some level that constructed water features, some or all, were imbued with any divine presence, but I am not aware of any examples, from Pompeii or elsewhere, of signs of religious practice in a water feature in a dwelling, such as provision for regular sacrifice or offerings.[29] As will be evident from the discussion following at 3.4, the subjects for sculpture decorating water features were far from limited to divinities or spirits strongly connected with water (or to divinities at all).[30] A villa owner who happened to possess within his grounds a natural water grotto, true spring or stream or river running through undoubtedly did have something which he could imbue with religious or spiritual significance.[31] On the other hand they might feel it was just plain superior to and more impressive than 'artificial' water,[32] or find it a matter of scientific rather than spiritual significance,[33] or simply useful - 'running water all over the place and plenty of it'.[34] Even where, for example, the shape of a single niche fountain at Pompeii might call to mind that of a lararium, the context (often aligned with dining couches or the entrance) and the decoration (Silenus, genre figures) indicate a different role entirely. This is not to deny that, for example in a garden, the water combined with landscaping and carefully chosen sculpture, could add to a sacred, or mythical, atmosphere, or might be the location for specific and appropriate dedications.[35]

In addition water might be used on its own or in combination with sculpture to recall specific locations with a special significance for the owner or Romans generally or to create the kind of educated landscapes referred to here at 3.4.[36] The setting of Scylla groups at Sperlonga, Castel Gandolfo and the Villa, in water, when the original events

---

[29] There are signs of religious activity in natural grottoes such as Matromania on Capri even if there is no agreement on what (Lavagne 1988 561ff for a summary), and natural sources attracted offerings (and curse tablets), for example at Bath.

[30] Andersson 1991 (especially 550) has mounted a complex argument, inspired by what she freely admits is a very unusual fountain basin, for the ubiquitous metaphorical and metamorphic presence of Dionysus in the fountain or more specifically in bubbling fountain basins. Most basins do not bear any Dionysiac motifs.

[31] As Statius personifies the river Anio flowing through Manilius Vopiscus' villa at Tivoli (*Silvae* I.3).

[32] As implied by Cicero *De Leg.* 2.1-2.

[33] Pliny *Ep.*4.30.2 enjoying a meal and a drink of cold water provided by a spring with a curious cyclical flow.

[34] Cicero *Ad Q.F* 3.1.line 1on the beneficial diversion of a stream and 3 on the practical and decorative benefits of running water.

[35] It is tempting, for example, to link the find of a battered head of one of the Dioscouri, life size, in a pool in the peristyle garden at Sirmium (Neudecker 1988 Cat.60) with Catullus 4 - which references the dedication (perhaps literally) of the prow of his ship to the Dioscouri on his safe return home.

[36] See 2.2 on nomenclature of parts of residences and for example 7.5.1 for the term Canopus at the Villa.

took place at sea, is obviously appropriate though 7.5 concludes it is going too far to suggest that the subject had a purely imperial connection and significance.

There is an element of conspicuous consumption in the display of water. A good supply was not freely available to all; it could therefore be a mark of wealth, power, or excess. A tinkling jet in the atrium of a Pompeian house indicated to the passer by that the owner had paid to be connected to the aqueduct supply.[37] Pools like seas marked the extravagance of Lucullus and Nero.[38] The archaeological evidence shows that water was used in combination with other elements in the construction of desirable or impressive views. Small-scale examples from Pompeii include the carefully constructed view into the atrium of the Casa del Torello with its expensive bronze fountain statue on a pedestal, with water falling originally via a basin into the impluvium, or the view down the sculpture lined canal from the biclinia in the House of Loreius Tiburtinus.[39] Well-to-do Romans had long had pools within their homes in the atrium where they had an early useful purpose as rainwater catchment/disposal basins. Decoration in the form of spouts or fountain statues or basins, or other statuary, became increasingly common in the 1st century AD (so far as we can tell from Pompeii, where the pool often remained linked to storage cisterns).[40] Little has been written about the spread of pools to other internal locations and this will be considered at 5.2.

Finally, there is the question of taste and fashion and the extent to which these were represented in and expressed through water features, in the same way as they were in changing styles of, say, wall painting. Although older features could be retained for a long time (as discussed at 2.5 in the context of the Villa), certain types of design and details of design rose and fell in the frequency of their usage. The chronological analysis of the typologies indicates this, and it is supported by my analysis at Chapters 4-7. This suggests that the selection of the design of a newly built water feature was being driven by considerations of taste and fashion.

---

[37] Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 did not unfortunately include in their 177-fountain Ostia catalogue any observations on whether and where water was apparently being deliberately displayed.
[38] Plutarch *Lucullus* 39, Suetonius *Nero* 31.
[39] Andersson 1990 Fig. 2; Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.133.
[40] Andersson 1990 208-215 is the best summary of the state of research on elaborated impluvia.

Different forms of water feature might relate to all these considerations of role and value in different ways, as will become evident in the following Chapters. The overall impression of a water feature was of course not just a consequence of its form but also of its own decoration to which I now turn.

3.4 Research on the decoration of water features

Water features could be decorated in several different ways. First the structural surface was invariably (with the possible except of natural rock) finished with a selection of different materials from a repertoire of plaster and paint, pumice, mosaic, stucco or marble facings. Second the point at which the water exited could be elaborated with a spout or relief. Third the water could exit via some sort of container or basin, and finally fountain statues or other non-fountain statuary might be used. Here the conclusions of the existing literature are briefly outlined – detailed further references are made in the discussion at Chapters 8 and 9, when the material from the Villa is discussed and put in context.

The different forms of decoration have been discussed to differing extents in the modern literature. Neuerburg 1965 and Letzner 1999 cover the whole range but very briefly; their main focus is on the structures.[41] Jashemski 1979-1993 is again a mine of information about all these forms as they appear in Campanian gardens. Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 describe any surface decoration of the Ostia structures and any basins in situ but link very little of the sculpture in the museum to the locations.[42] There is one publication dedicated to fountain figures (Kapossy 1969) and another to statuary from villas (Neudecker 1988). The latter focuses on figural sculpture, excludes Hadrian's Villa from its scope, and does not directly address the type of sculpture which might be linked with water features.

Looking first at surface decoration, there are complex arguments surrounding the chronological development of wall and ceiling mosaics, and changes in the style of painted wall decoration in the late Republic and early Empire.[43] Writers on the

---

[41] See Neuerburg 1965 91ff and Letzner 1999 252ff.
[42] Vol.2 9 – it is not clear whether this is a deliberate limitation of the survey or a practical impossibility.
[43] Lavagne 1973a and Lavagne 1988, Sear 1975 and Sear 1977, and many others, discuss the emergence of wall and ceiling mosaic. Dunbabin 1999 236f on wall and vault mosaics and 254f on opus sectile has a good summary. Mielsch 1975 covers stucco and Joyce 1981moves discussion particularly of painted walls (she does not deal with mosaic or faced walls) and ceilings into the 2nd century AD. See Ling 1991 for an introduction and bibliography on the earlier so-called four painted styles.

development of mosaic in the first century AD, its use in dwellings, and its move upwards from floors to walls to ceilings, generally see 'proper' mosaic using manufactured coloured glass, as replacing over time the earlier use of pumice, shells and other natural materials in fountain environments. As for the subjects which might be depicted in panels on water features, much of the evidence for this comes from Campania (and there is no evidence from the Villa with which to compare it). Pumice is ignored in general treatments of wall and ceiling decoration and this tends to be accompanied by, or to generate, an assumption that pumice died out except in specialised non-domestic locations such as say mithraea.[44] So far as I am aware, there is no detailed survey of the growth in the application of marble to walls.

Very little has been written about point of exit decoration though there are many examples of nozzles and spouts in museums. Neuerburg 1965 says that there were theatrical masks used as fountain spouts but he does not actually give any examples and this suggestion is examined much more closely and critically at 8.2.1.[45]

As for containers, and again despite their ubiquity in museum collections, there is no detailed publication on all the forms and their usage.[46] Apart from Jashemski 1979-1993 for Campanian gardens[47] and Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 for some of the Ostia objects, and the museum catalogues, there are a few accounts of individual pieces and their comparisons – for example Andersson 1991 on the House of the Ceii basin, Steinby 1989 on the Lacus Iuturnae basin, Varming 1965 on four monumental basins in Rome. The subject is a large one and another area where the ancient terms – particularly labrum – mystify as much as clarify.[48] Where there are fragmentary remains it can be difficult to tell whether they come from a fountain basin or not. If a container was not piped but merely held water, it can be hard to distinguish from a lustral basin, if it has no detailed provenance or context.[49] Sometimes (most often in

---

[44] Joyce 1981 for example does not mention pumice.
[45] Neuerburg 1965 98.
[46] Ambrogi 1998 n.4 announces her intention of publishing a monograph on rounded types (not seen). As 8.3 will indicate, containers could take many other forms – crater shapes and troughs for example.
[47] Also Pernice 1932.
[48] The term 'labrum' is often used for basins containing water and crops up in the sources - see Hilgers 1969 199 No. 202 for various references to different uses of 'labrum' and more generally Letzner 1999 97. Labrum is not exclusively a 'water' term and covers a range of shapes and designs (though broadly denoting flattish basins on stems).
[49] See for example two square basins with handles on elegant columns, one with a dedicatory inscription, from the Temple of Isis at Pompeii, and evidently from their context intended for ceremonial cleansing (Ruesch 1908 910 and 912, RMB 1824-57 VII Frontispiece and text). Compare with the very similar single square basin from the House of the Balcony VII 12 28 (Jashemski 1979-

Campania) a basin is preserved virtually intact and even in situ so that we can clearly see how it was intended to be used but even at Pompeii care is needed – the basin from the House of the Ceii was a piped fountain and was found in a fountain location but was not actually connected to the water supply.[50]

In the absence of a full account to refer to, at 8.3 I have had to pull together in an admittedly very brief form the evidence for containers for the purposes of comparison with the Villa objects. I have looked not just at the physical remains, but also at the garden paintings too which are useful to confirm and expand the patchy physical evidence. I share the view and reasoning of Moormann 1988[51] that the paintings show real life objects accurately, though not necessarily in real combinations.[52]

Finally fountain figures and other sculpture, where I have already mentioned Kapossy and Neudecker and should also note again Raeder 1983 for the Villa. The latter is a catalogue of statuary from the Villa which addresses the question of provenance very thoroughly.[53] It is however limited to three-dimensional figural sculpture and therefore does not cover all the material relevant to this thesis and does not specifically address the question of the decoration of water features.

Kapossy establishes that the most common surviving fountain figures comprised members of the Dionysiac circle,[54] nymphs/Aphrodite and animals. However fountain figure subjects are not particular to fountain figures and fountain figures are found alongside non-fountain works. Fluvial gods and shell-bearing nymphs are strongly associated with fountain figures,[55] and some other types are clearly particularly suited to use as fountain figures (anyone who could be represented with an urn or wineskin);

1993 II Cat.385) – in this case the basin received water from a fountain statue close by and overflowed into a basin on the edge of a garden and had quite a different, decorative, role.

[50] Andersson 1991 546 and 559. Does this reflect a plan for connection prevented by the interruption of the aqueduct supply at Pompeii after the earthquake, or was there never any intention to connect it but merely display it, or is there some other explanation?

[51] Moormann 1988 254ff (English summary).

[52] Grassinger takes a different view as regards pictures of crater fountains – see 8.3 n.77.

[53] Using a 5 tier system: Catalogue I - credibly ascribed to the Villa, either extant or known from drawings (147 pieces); Catalogue II – credibly ascribed to the Villa, lost, no drawing (26); Catalogue III – doubtfully ascribed to the Villa (105); Catalogue IV – wrongly ascribed to the Villa (29); Catalogue V – contents of the d'Este collection with no established link to the Villa, which are sometimes ascribed to it.

[54] By which I mean Dionysus, maenads, Silenus, satyrs, associated animals and other mythical creatures linked with the woods and nature.

[55] Kapossy 1969 69, among others.

some variations appear to have been specifically designed as fountains.[56] Figures might be adapted for use as a fountain in a fairly crude way. Examples of figures with pipes simply attached come not just from the House of the Vettii peristyle but also from the more sophisticated (one might think) environment of the Baths of Caracalla.[57] Conversely, the evidence also suggests that fountain figures were not necessarily used as active fountains. There are numerous examples of fountain figures from Pompeii which were not plumbed in, perhaps sometimes due to the disruption of the water supply following the earthquake of 62AD. For example at the House of Camillus there was a fountain statue of boy and hare in the waterless east niche, two more satyr child fountains apparently unconnected to piping in the garden, no less than 5 bronze spouts of various designs were stored indoors.[58] Yet the same phenomenon occurs elsewhere[59] leading one to conclude that a fountain statue might be displayed in a place where there was no intention of using it as a fountain figure.

Whether fountain figure or non-fountain figure, as ever there is the problem of identifying the original location of figural sculpture, even where find spot is recorded. It is immensely frustrating, for example, that we know nothing of the find spots of the 50 or more pieces recovered from the Villa dei Quintili[60] on the Appian Way in the late 18th century, a large villa which was begun probably in the Hadrianic period[61] and which reused earlier pieces as well as second century sculpture. Where and in what combinations were these originally displayed?

Notwithstanding these difficulties, Neudecker 1988 seeks to understand the complete statuary landscape, of fountain and non-fountain figures, but without specific reference to water feature ensembles. Kapossy does discuss the type of groupings and locations

---

[56] For example Dwyer 1982 76, amorino with dolphin on his shoulder from House of Fortuna (Pompeii IX 7 20).
[57] DeLaine 1997 33 n.44 - hand holding a pipe.
[58] VII 12 22/3, Dwyer 1982 59-67. Dwyer 1982 59 suggests that the spouts were being stored for future use in the garden but in fact the water outlet in the garden appears to have been in the central basin – and this was already occupied by a table fountain with a serpent spout. The quality of the stored pieces is very different to and worse than that of the serpent spout in use. Did the owner really intend to incorporate 5 more spouts plus three fountain statuettes in his garden, or were the spouts, particularly, being stored for some other purpose (sale?). Further examples of fountains not plumbed in from Campania are at Cat.2 B3 n.8.
[59] For example the Grotto of the Nymph Egeria (9.2.1).
[60] Neudecker 1988 Cat.39.
[61] Finding of AD 125 brick stamp in residential core reported Paris 2000 21.

in which his fountain figures were used, and why, but very briefly.[62] Both writers identify the creation of cultural or educated landscapes around water features – opportunities for the owner to express and make visible their interests, and breadth of knowledge. On a more prosaic level there is also evidence from Pompeii at least of the display of valuable pieces in the most visible locations.[63]

It is also evident from both writers that frequently mixed iconography is found within the same setting and similar figures could be found in very different settings - one simply cannot say that images of athletes are only found in the palaestra or images of thinkers are only found in libraries or rooms set out as philosopher galleries, or satyrs are only found in gardens. In this I disagree with Marvin 1989 (passim) who, drawing principally on the letters of Cicero, proposes that a narrow view of 'appropriateness' was the main driver for choice of programme for location, though it might have been true in Cicero's particular case.[64] Vitruvius' (VII.5) narrow view of appropriateness is, as he protests, at odds with the real life practice of his day. At its most extreme this could lead to what Zanker has called in the case of Pompeii 'models that have been heaped one upon the other and jumbled together until the sense of their original meaning and function is largely lost'.[65] However unexpected juxtapositions are found in the bigger properties too and this area is explored in greater depth in Chapter 9.

Bartmann in particular[66] has identified influences other than appropriate iconography on choice for display – value might be attached for example to the age of a piece or its technical virtuosity. The display of historical or contemporary or family portraits might convey status on the owner. Reference might be made to well known larger displays elsewhere. She has also suggested the use of pendants not just (or even) because of their matching iconography but also because of the visual or aesthetic interest of their subtle differences as well as their similarities.[67] Because of these complexities, she implies, knowing who the owner was, or more precisely, knowing

---

[62] Kapossy 1969 57ff – less than 20 pages, much of which refers to baths and other structure outside the scope of this thesis.
[63] To take but one example, the bull at Casa del Torello, visible from the street.
[64] Marvin's description of the Scenic Triclinium and Canal as a 'romantic Egyptian dreamland' is both inaccurate in terms of the sculptural subjects and vastly understates its complexity (see detailed discussion of the complex in 7.5 and 9.4.
[65] Zanker 1998 193.
[66] Bartmann 1991, passim.
[67] Also Vermeule 1977 Chapter 1-2 on mirror images and other pairings though he makes some unsubstantiated assertions (for example 12 ' the usual courtyard or house side garden' - I am not aware of any which follow the exact pattern described).

their 'mind map' is a prerequisite for a full understanding of their choice of subject or style.[68]

The existing literature therefore indicates that the rationale for the choice of figure sculpture for particular locations might well be rather complex, and since we rarely have a full picture of all the sculptural decoration (which might of course be interspersed too with paintings and other images) it is dangerous to assume that we can interpret it accurately or completely.

3.5 Classification used for water features at the Villa

Since the existing typologies and approaches did not on their own cover the breadth and complexity of the Villa structures nor, by focussing on the water structure in isolation from its context, facilitate the uncovering of broader design features or aspects of use and value, I decided to classify the Villa structures for the purposes of this thesis as follows. Chapter 4 takes four fountain types - grottoes, fountain rooms, cavea shapes and fountain walls. These are generally recognised in the standard typologies though I do not necessarily wholly agree, as will be seen, with the way they have previously been analysed. The Villa examples are explored and set against the historical background and issues of function and role in the wider Villa begin to be addressed. Chapter 5 deals with pools in a similar way - as indicated above, pools have been a neglected area. Chapter 6 identifies a type of fountain, the block fountain, which has escaped attention in the general handbooks but is clearly present at the Villa; it also looks at water steps and small deep walled up basins and the way they are used at the Villa and elsewhere, two aspects of water feature design which have received little or very dispersed coverage in the past. Chapter 7 takes the large complex features, which combine water features usually seen separately, or not at all, one at a time.

My analysis of the decoration of the water features of Hadrian's Villa against the research background briefly outlined, and the specific precedents discussed in more detail later, is divided between Chapter 8 on the first three categories (surface decoration, point of exit decoration and water containers) and Chapter 9 on fountain

---

[68] Bartmann 1988 218 'When precise information is lacking about the identity of the villa owner is lacking, as it so often is, there may be little agreement as to the meaning of the decorative programme, and those interpretations that are advanced often appear highly subjective'.

figures and other figure sculpture. Since my overall objective is to present, as far as possible, a complete image of the visual impression of a water feature, I take all figures associated with decorative water features together in Chapter 9, whether they acted as fountains or not. Chapter 9 has been further subdivided in a way which helps to focus attention on the whole water feature and its possible role and uses, considering first particular types of structure and what might be found on or with them (pools, grottoes, structures with niches and other structures) and then looking more generally at groupings of statues and the arrangement of statuary for views.

In the Conclusions at Chapter 10, I discuss my findings in Chapters 4-9 and their wider implications for the role and developing design of water features.

Conclusions

This short critical review of research on decorative water features, so far as it is relevant to the structures from Hadrian's Villa, found that neither a terminological basis nor a strict application of fountain typologies are an adequate basis for studying the full breadth of water features found at the Villa. Research on the decoration of the architectural structures has neglected areas such as water containers and shown a very complex background to the display of figure sculpture. These findings led to the development of a classification system for the structures, and a process for approaching discussion of their decoration which would assist in achieving the objects of this thesis especially as regards achieving a fuller understanding of the uses and roles of water features.

In the next Chapter I start to look in detail at the architectural structures of the Villa using the classification proposed, and begin with four identifiable and distinct types, grottoes, fountain rooms, cavea shaped fountains and fountain walls.

4. Grottoes, fountain rooms, cavea shapes and fountain walls

Introduction

This Chapter begins the discussion of the water features of the Villa, their relationship to the architectural precedents and what their physical settings at the Villa suggests about the roles they played in the Villa. The four types dealt with in the Chapter are clearly recognisable at the Villa and broadly recognised by the standard fountain catalogues as occurring in other places before their appearance at the Villa.

4.1 Grottoes

4.1.1 Background

In discussions of the development and typology of fountain rooms, the natural grotto is usually taken as the first source of inspiration, whose forms are copied, and elaborated in designs which over time assume an appearance entirely different to irregular natural forms and muted natural colouration but which still in some sense signify the cave.[1] Yet carving out a cave-like form is an act of creation, so that from the moment when the Romans began creating decorative caves in new locations for themselves, they were creating what they wanted, where they wanted it, rather than responding to what there was. Their response to, or desire for, a tenth generation created cave is likely to be different to their relationship with a natural cave[2] and the possible origins of forms are not necessarily a guide to their later significance.

A grotto is a natural rocky cave, not necessarily containing a water source or indeed any water, on the coast or inland. It was traditionally assumed to be the home of nymphs, Nereids, muses or other spirits, and appears (under a variety of Greek and Latin names) in mythological stories such as the story of Odysseus and Polyphemus, in

---

[1] For example Neuerburg 1965 31. Glaser 1987 and Glaser 2000 on the other hand rightly emphasise the complexity and diversity of fountain house (meaning structures where water was drawn for practical purposes) architecture, as particularly evident in Greece.

[2] This is where, in principle, I part company from Lavagne who sees the Scenic Triclinium, though a long way down the track, as still redolent for the viewer of the real grotto (for example Lavagne 1988 595), and even Ginouvès 1969 165 who believes the Villa structures recall their origins in the details, and are therefore tinged with religious feeling.

other literature (especially pastoral poetry) and is depicted in wall paintings especially those of pastoral landscapes.[3]

What relevance did the concept of the grotto, spiritual or physical, have to the design of water features at the Villa? Recent work, especially in Rakob 1964 and Lavagne 1988, has used the concept as an aid to understanding and interpreting and to some extent reconstructing certain structures, and their decoration, at the Villa. The structures commonly cited are the small 'grotto' under the Doric Temple (Cat.1 R1, Fig.5 5), the fountain in the Republican cryptoporticus (Cat.1 R4, Fig.12), the small room set into the cavea fountain at the south end of the Stadium Garden (Cat.1 H12, Fig.59), the Park Grotto (Cat.1 H19, Fig.95) and the Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H17, Fig.83). I add to the list for consideration the water display in the Large Baths cryptoporticus (Cat.1 H1, Fig.21).

4.1.2 Direct use of natural or cut grottoes

'The Roman magnate... would hardly fail to possess one or more grottoes, dark semi-caves for the nymphs, with ferns and water dripping from roughened stones'.[4] In fact, the number of occasions where we can identify a natural grotto which has clearly been used by the Romans,[5] or a space which has been directly hewn from the rock, and brought within the ambit of a villa, is relatively small – maybe 15 or 20, depending exactly where the borderline between natural and artificial, or 'grotto' and 'fountain room' is drawn.[6] A disproportionate number of these are on the coast in Campania, or on Capri[7] – clearly geography and location influenced the ability to own a true grotto – and naturally the coastal grottoes often did not have a fresh water source (or ferns) but were instead filled by the incoming sea and might only be accessible by boat. One of

---

[3] The natural or natural looking grotto is not represented in the garden paintings (catalogued by Jashemski 1979-1993 II) nor in any of the real gardens which have been identified and explored archaeologically.
[4] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 4.
[5] Who have left traces such as structural changes or additions.
[6] Neuerburg 1965's category 'Ninfei a grotta e camere intagliate nella roccia' amounts to no more than 15; Letzner 1999's slightly more broadly based Types 2 (Natürliche Grotten) and 3 (Künstliche Grotten) no more than 20 in total.
[7] Where coastal cavities are concerned, use in fish farming was also an option so that we can find adjacent series of natural, dug out or enhanced caves serving alternately decorative and more practical purposes. There are 4 such caves (2 decorative rooms and 2 fishponds) at the Villa of Agrippa Postumus, Sorrento (Mingazzini and Pfister 1946 110ff). Even fishponds might include decorative elements such as plastered niches and sitting places.

the best-known examples of this is the Grotta Azzurra on Capri, some of whose marine statuary decoration has only recently been identified and recovered (9.3.1).

The habit of elaborating natural grottoes in Italy is demonstrated as early as the third century BC by the survival of a series of terracotta ex-voto models from a grotto at Locri.[8] These show architectural frameworks being applied to, very probably, natural caves and sources. Later paintings of pastoral or sacro-idyllic landscapes also show tidied up rocky cavities where water flows both naturally, and over cut surfaces through artificial spouts into artificial containers.[9]

We know from Seneca of a pair of artificial grottoes (speluncae) in a villa, which are clearly to be understood in this context as carved from rock. They are described as expensive (because artificial) and large (the comparison is with an atrium, another wholly man made and regular feature) and finally that they were oriented one to stay cool and the other to stay warm (an important factor in the design and selection of dining rooms for different times of year).[10] The use of the term spelunca does not mean that Vatia and his guests would actually perceive themselves as occupying a cavern, any more than visitors walking in a garden would actually regard a canal in a garden as the River Nile or the Euripus.[11]

Natural grottoes however were not always in convenient places and nor were rocky outcrops which could be excavated. By the second century AD, wholly artificial constructions with water appeared in many different contexts (on streets, in the middle of wings in houses, out in the open air) and in many different forms (as freestanding walls, as elements of suites of rooms, with straight or curved surfaces). The question is whether any of these still significantly recalled the grotto for the viewer.

4.1.3 The natural and the man made

During the first century AD the Romans distinguished between, and created landscapes and structures which (at one extreme) were entirely regular, well ordered and artificial,

---

[8] Lavagne 1988 149ff.
[9] Neuerburg 1965 Fig. 1 for an illustration of a lost painting, Lavagne 1993 for more details; Lehmann 1953 Plates 20-22 for the Boscoreale painting.
[10] Seneca *Ep.* 55.6.
[11] See 5.1.2 for the ability to distinguish natural and man made watercourses and the use of playful nomenclature.

and (at the other) were irregular and more natural in appearance, even if not entirely natural in origins. In their villas, where there was more space than in town and maybe a choice of desirable sites or at least orientation, they could potentially enjoy and experience both ends of the spectrum.

This enjoyment is evident from the two villa letters of Pliny and the two villa poems of Statius. These are highly crafted writings, and we do not know how closely they reflected the reality of the four villas they described. Nonetheless in each of them there is a clear pleasure in both the natural and the created, and the contrast between the two. The direct imitation of nature is not especially celebrated though natural images are used as metaphors or comparisons.

At the Laurentine villa Pliny frequently mentions views of the sea[12] but he also takes pleasure in the sight of the neighbouring villas.[13] At the Tuscan villa the cultivated landscape is appreciated alongside the natural,[14] the formal garden and the natural meadow are described precisely as equals in beauty,[15] the view of a cryptoporticus as pleasant as a view of the vineyard.[16] The formal organisation (urbanissimo) of the hippodrome garden, which he is very proud of, is described as interrupted at the centre by an area which looks like a piece of open country (rus).[17] In Statius' description of Vopiscus' villa at Tivoli the natural charms of the river, forests and rural views, and the wonderful buildings decorated with lavish materials and works of art are equally praised.[18] In his description of Pollius Felix' villa near Sorrento there are similar themes and here the 'taming' of nature in some parts of the property is presented in a positive light.[19]

---

[12] *Ep.* 2.7.5, 6, 12, 20, 21 (2 references).
[13] *Ep.* 2.7.12, 21, 27.
[14] *Ep.* 5.6.7f
[15] *Ep.* 5.6.18.
[16] *Ep.* 5.6.30.
[17] *Ep.* 5.6 35.
[18] *Silvae* 1.3; on the practical side, the baths (as usual) are mentioned and the clever aqueduct piping crossing the river (lines 43 and 67).
[19] *Silvae* 2.2.30 and 52. Lucullus' activities in the same part of the country were presented in a less positive light (Plutarch *Lucullus* 39).

4.1.3 The idea of the grotto-triclinium

The modern term 'grotto-triclinium' must be considered against this background – the direct use of natural grottoes, the perception of natural versus man made, and the creation of wholly artificial and very sophisticated fountain rooms and structures.

Rakob's 1964 article, in which the term first appears, largely consists of a detailed description of the triclinium fountain room at the House of Julia Felix. This is the 'Grottentriklinium in Pompeji' of his title and he says it is a unique example in Pompeii.[20] His subsequent argument is loosely connected and developed largely and vaguely in footnotes. He is clear that the Scenic Triclinium at the Villa is another grotto-triclinium[21] but he cites many other locations without making it clear which grotto or triclinium features they possess (or do not),[22] or indeed how exactly he is defining a grotto-triclinium in terms of the architectural or decorative features it should possess. His identifications seem rest partly on structure and partly on the materials used for decoration (such as pumice) but the concept is so nebulous and vaguely drawn that it is hard to get to grips with it. Water steps appear to be important but the linkage of water steps[23] with grottoes is discussed at 6.2.2 and found to be weak. The idea of making an artificial grotto-triclinium does not of course appear in Roman literature where the features which are stressed in descriptions of dining are orientation (winter/summer, the admitting of light and heat), views for the diners outwards, the sumptuousness of the setting, the availability of choice of location, food, entertainment, conversation and company.

The Julia Felix room was certainly not the only structure of its type at Pompeii. The dining room with water steps at VI 17 Ins. Occ. 42 (not excavated at the time Rakob

---

[20] 185.
[21] 191.
[22] The structure at the end of the large pool at San Marco for example is referred to at several points and described in Abb.9 as a Grottenexedra. Despite the clarity of his plan, and speculation by others for example that it contained a cascade (Barbet and Miniero 1999 373) it is in fact not at all clear what lay at the centre of and behind the semicircular niched wall and where dining might take place (Fig.130.1). The wall itself is in the open air and neither its structure nor its stucco and mosaic decoration are reminiscent of a grotto.
[23] The room adjoining the Domus Aurea Octagon (Fig.137.2) is cited in his discussion of other grotto-triclinia – here there are steps but the decorative materials used have totally disappeared. Whether it was used for dining is not known.

was writing) contains basically the same structural elements as the Julia Felix room,[24] as does VIII 2 28.[25] The first does not appear to have had pumice though there were shells. Its predominant surface feature however is the extensive and very high quality mosaic decoration with, especially, garden representations. These are not remotely redolent of the grotto. VIII 2 28 had pumice and mosaic decoration and the remains of a painting with marine subjects. The decoration of the Julia Felix room is only partly known - the vault decoration and many other elements have disappeared and the figured decoration which remains is a painted Nilotic scene. Thus rooms of the same type could have very different decorative content. Rakob is presumably relying on the ochre washed pumice as evidence for the grotto impression of the décor of the Julia Felix room, rather than the Nilotic scenes (which are common in a wide range of locations). Yet as we will see at 8.1, pumice too finds its way into a whole range of situations. At the house of Julia Felix itself, the same ochre washed pumice appears in planted niches in the garden. Perhaps it is the combination of structural features *and* decoration which makes a grotto-triclinium - but if the same structure can be used with radically different decoration – as at VI 17 Ins. Occ. 42 - then it appears that the link of such structures with the grotto has become rather tenuous.

Rakob would not have known at the time of writing of the fountain room at Punta Epitaffio and this is another structure which is only partly redolent of the grotto. Essentially the back part of the room - hollowed out to look like a cave and containing a representation of the inebriation of Polyphemus in his cave - was all fake grotto (there are no water steps). The front part of the room is the triclinium[26] and had, in its first phase, decoration including pumice, shells and mosaic,[27] but also a very different decorative programme with figures of Dionysus and dynastic representations (see 9.3.1).[28] So here 'grotto' references are interwoven with other themes which appear to be important too.

---

[24] The structure and details of the room, apart from the mosaic, still do not appear however to have been fully published and the best information is Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.313 and at Rediscovering Pompeii 1992 Cat.194.
[25] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.35, Letzner 1999 Cat.123.
[26] Paralleling and predating the Julia Felix model, with dining couches, canal running round the back of them, and water in the middle – this time from the sea.
[27] Later covered by marble facings – this suggests that it was (no longer) felt to be essential to the effect of this part of the structure (Sciarelli 1983 33).
[28] The assemblage is assumed by the excavators to be the Julio Claudian and unamended choice for the room decoration.

It appears that, where we have substantive knowledge of the decorative programme of dining structures like the Julia Felix room, the decorative programme was either not grotto-like at all (VI 17 Ins. Occ. 42) or far more complex than a simple fake grotto (Baiae). The evidence at Pompeii or elsewhere does not support the premise that in the first century AD the Romans would have recognised the concept of a grotto-triclinium except in the very unusual case of a triclinium actually being established in a real grotto, as at Sperlonga, and here too the grotto theme was tainted by decoration with other subjects (9.3.1).

4.1.5 Grottoes and the Villa

The rock cut room under the Doric Temple (Fig.5 no.5), and the fountain in the Republican cryptoporticus (Fig.12.2 and 3), were remnants of pre-Hadrianic structures and as outlined in 2.5, they remained accessible, but they do not appear to have had any important role in the new Villa.[29]

The water display in the Large Baths cryptoporticus (Fig. 20.2 and 21) consists of rock cut niches and running water somewhat reminiscent of natural grottoes. It is widely accepted these days that the Large Baths were intended for the use of service personnel.[30] However the oblique view of feature d (Figs.20 and 21), the low height of the aperture of feature e (discussed in the Catalogue entry, also Fig.20.2), and the lack of connection directly between cryptoporticus and palaestra, combine to suggest that this cryptoporticus and its features are half hearted and carelessly treated and conceived. The Hadrianic four sided cryptoporticus of the Peristyle Pool Building by contrast is carefully worked into a major complex (Figs. 51, 52 and 54.2).

The small room set into the cavea fountain at the south end of the Stadium Garden (Fig.59 and 60) is very different both in terms of the care with which it was created and its place in an overall design. Lavagne for example[31] sees this room as a grotto descendant. The hooded curved shape, filled with water, its vault covered in pumice,

---

[29] Lavagne 1988 596 also includes the Republican fountain room in the Residence Quadrangle as a grotto; this is in keeping with his very broad definition of grottoes.
[30] For example MacDonald and Pinto 1995 71. Salza Prina Ricotti 1992 62 graphically illustrates the comparative economy of decoration by Figs 15 and 16 comparing the simple black and white mosaic flooring of the Large Baths with rich opus sectile flooring from the Small Baths.
[31] Lavagne 1988 602 where he further attempts to link the whole Stadium Garden complex to the grotto tradition via his suggestion of a grotto link for the Niobid group (see 9.2.2).

alludes to, without in any sense trying to reproduce, a natural structure. On the other hand the external and internal profiles of the room are unnaturally regular. The pumice changes to white marble below water level. The structure is set bang in the middle of another water feature, a cavea fountain, which, aside from its plantings, has no connection with the grotto or natural forms, and the room is positioned behind a completely regular pool (Fig.61.1). There would have been much marble on/in all the surfaces around the room. The dark little room has been chosen to terminate an important view, which consists of layers of superimposed architectural frameworks, other objects, and regular sheets of water (Fig.56.2). The idea of the grotto itself has been miniaturised, regularised, and utilised as part of a grander architectural scheme for which the grotto has no conceptual relevance. It is a convenient building block in a much larger design. The roof, internally a barrel vault which slopes down to the rear (Fig.57.2), echoes the very unusual shape of the roof of the Republican fountain room in the Residence Quadrangle (Cat.1 R3, Fig.11.1). In this context the slope helps visually to draw the eye into the terminus of the long view but maybe also the architect was deliberately recalling the older room design (in a playful way?).

Lavagne includes the East Belvedere (Figs.28-30) among the grottoes.[32] Were it not for the survival of the pumice decoration, I do not think this suggestion would be made. This is a wholly regular room, closed at the front, with nothing suggesting the natural in its shape. For this reason I am reluctant to class it with the Park Grotto, discussed next, in terms of significance, though the extent of the pumice clearly suggests some allusion to a rocky setting. The room is discussed more thoroughly as a fountain room at 4.2.4

The Park Grotto on the other hand justifies MacDonald and Pinto 1995's nomenclature (Figs.95-6). Though artificial and regularised, it is an open hollow, which is devoid of fancy materials within it or nearby, so far as we can tell in the current state of excavation. It has an isolated location (Fig.1 44) well away from any major building complex. It is the closest thing there is at the Villa to a 'dark semi-cave for the nymphs, with ferns and water dripping from roughened stones.' I have suggested at 9.3.2 that the Polyphemus group from the Villa may have found a home in the Park Grotto and that it could have housed a summer and essentially outdoor dining area but at present there is no firm evidence of how the Grotto was used. MacDonald and Pinto

[32] Lavagne 1988 598.

1995 has a thoughtful discussion of its possible symbolism or function – while rejecting the crude Styx-Inferi interpretation favoured since Ligorio, they are of the view that the Grotto had a function beyond the decorative.[33] Salza Prina Ricotti links it unconvincingly with the Platform Structure and some sort of replica of Eleusis.[34] What is clear is that at the beginning of the second century AD, the wealthy Roman could, given some minimal geographic conditions, create a reasonable imitation of a grotto, *if he wanted to* (my stress) and Hadrian did so with the Park Grotto.[35]

On the other hand he could choose to use the techniques and shapes developed over the previous 200 years (mosaic made of brightly coloured glasses, complex vaults which enabled the creation of large suites of symmetrical curved spaces) which though they might have originated in natural ideas (pebbles and shells, the curve of a cave) now essentially had a life of their own and occurred in places and in functions which were numerous and diverse. It is this choice that we see exercised at the Scenic Triclinium.

The revelation in the 1950s, with the uncovering of the stibadium, that the Scenic Triclinium was in fact used for dining, has revolutionised understanding of the building though somehow it has not entirely stopped interpretations of it as some sort of shrine (as well). Exactly how it was used for dining it discussed in much more detail at 7.5. The Scenic Triclinium today has a hooded and cave like appearance from the outside (Fig.83.1) but its original appearance would have been quite different[36] with its massive columnar façade, the water reflecting off the dramatic vaulted roof covered in brightly coloured mosaic inside. The front surfaces were marble faced, the covering of the roof is not known.[37] Once within the entrance it is true that pumice would have been visible in alternating stibadium niches and the large rear niche – but it alternated with more mosaic and marble, not to mention a statuary programme in the niches

---

[33] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 123-124.
[34] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 312-315. However there does not actually appear to be any convenient way from the Grotto to the Platform – the Grotto connects to the Underground Galleries but they do not connect to the Platform Structure. The canal she also suggests led down to the Grotto does not find any parallel at Eleusis.
[35] Neuerburg 1965 dates pure rock structures 2nd century AD at the latest. Letzner 1999 says the latest first occupation of wholly natural grottoes is 1st century AD and thinks man-made rock cuttings go through to the second century or later.
[36] See for example the reconstruction at Aurigemma 1958 Fig 16.
[37] The present surface is modern; it seems likely to me that originally it was sheathed in metal, especially if (as MacDonald and Pinto 1995 113 suggests convincingly), the semi dome was surmounted by a statue group, set in an extant dip in the surface.

whose subject matter is unknown. Water gushed over white marble steps and pooled in a series of entirely regular enclosures. Diners gazed out through the columnar façade at an elaborate sculptural programme in and around a clearly artificial pool. There had never been a 'grotto' on this magnificent scale, with these colours, so luxurious and so clearly wholly man made.[38] The Scenic Triclinium and Canal do not to my mind constitute in any way an attempt to consciously replicate architecturally, or even recall, grottoes at Sperlonga or Castel Gandolfo (Figs.80 and 129). There are too many and too major differences. There is no central round pool and in plan and elevation the construction is regular and symmetrical. Diners look out onto a canal, not into a grotto. The extent to which the statuary programme outside also did not reflect the grotto is discussed at 9.4.

If we accept, as outlined at 4.1.3 above, that the Romans recognised and indeed celebrated the difference and contrast between real and artificial/man made, one can only see the Park Grotto and the Scenic Triclinium, built at the same time for the same person, not as similar structures ('grottoes') but two entirely different structures. They should be understood differently and the conclusion of this survey of grottoes at the Villa and elsewhere is that among the major Hadrianic water features of the Villa, only the Park Grotto carried significant grotto connotations.

4.2 Fountain rooms

4.2.1 Background

The term fountain room is used here to mean an indoor (roofed, three or four walls), rectangular room, largely or totally man made, with decorative water in the wall(s) and/or floor.[39] The main roofing is usually a barrel vault. Dating from the second century BC onwards, these rooms vary in size, complexity, lay out and context. The room may include single or multiple niches, water steps, pools in the floor, columns and other architectural decoration, and rear extensions (rectangular, arched or apsed).

---

[38] Nonetheless Rakob 1964's concept has got a strong grasp on the literature from Lavagne 1988 606 to MacDonald and Pinto 1995 116 (banquet hall composed of an elaborate two part grotto) to Glaser 2000 465 (monumentalised form of the grotto triclinium).

[39] Corresponding broadly to Neuerburg 1965's category 'ninfeo a camera', and Letzner 1999's Type 3. Both authors categorise natural, or largely natural, spaces separately ('grottoes'), and they subdivide structures within the fountain room category differently. My definition excludes the largest and most complex 'fountain rooms' at the Villa whose shape is far more sophisticated than a simple rectangle.

In many cases there is poor understanding of the water works – most commonly it will be apparent that there was pipework to one or more of the niches, but no evidence of what happened to the water afterwards, and in particular, details of the location and size of floor basins are not known or not specifically recorded.[40] Context is often problematic – sometimes it will be clear that the room did form part of a private house, but in other cases the room has survived while any other structures around have not. They may be built into retaining walls or platforms, into a suite of rooms, or have stood apparently isolated. There are no contemporary literary descriptions which can be decisively tied up with these regularly shaped watery rooms yet they are a very common type, representing for example about one third of Neuerburg 1965's catalogue. There are three pre-Hadrianic examples at the Villa – the Fountain room under the Doric Temple, the Fountain room in the Residence Quadrangle, and the Fountain room behind the Water Court (Cat.1 R 1,3, and 6), and two Hadrianic – the East Belvedere fountain room and the Fountain room on the north side of the Residence (Cat.1 H3 and 9).

4.2.2 Origins and usage

A fundamental developmental link from natural grotto, to artificially elaborated grotto, to barrel vaulted fountain room, has been strongly advocated by the modern cataloguers, Neuerburg 1965 and Letzner 1999,[41] and this is supported by the evident importance of 'natural' decorative materials such as pumice and shells especially in earlier structures. In building these rooms the Romans are seen as importing grottoes and their mythical associations into the house. However Glaser has highlighted particularly the separate development and existence, especially evident in the Greek speaking world, of elaborate decorative constructions to shelter drinking, or otherwise functional water, at the point of supply[42] and some of the earliest examples in Italy

---

[40] Thus to take a very few examples: Villa of Quintilius Varus, floor buried (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.214); suite under the Parco di Traiano in Rome, floor in bad condition, no clear evidence of basins (Bizarri Vivarelli 1976 731); Segni, otherwise thoroughly and recently published but floor not cleared (Cifarelli 1995). At the Domus Aurea I have not found any full report of the visually confused floor structures in front of the water steps in the apparently exhaustively debated Odysseus fountain room (promised by Zander 1958, and here Fig.138). Thus Letzner 1999 Cat.71 refers to a rectangular pool and Rakob 1964 189 to a small horseshoe-shaped pool and Sear 1977 Cat.61 shows no pool but a horseshoe-shaped construction which he interprets as the remains of an apsed fountain.

[41] And by Lavagne studying the role of the grotto in Roman architecture and literature (Lavagne 1988 passim). Ginouvès 1969 142ff is another variation on broadly similar lines.

[42] Glaser 1987 and Glaser 2000.

recall these models. For example, the fountain room at Boville, dating from the later 2nd century BC, which had a well-like supply point at the rear. We cannot tell whether this was public or private, or sheltered a sacred well and/or a regular water supply. Structurally, with its (stone block) vault, apse at the end housing the water supply and separating it from the room in front, and carved details (cornice and sculpting of the roof to resemble natural materials) it possesses typical fountain room features. [43]

However, by the first century AD architectural features 'typical' of fountain rooms, such as the rear apse, were occurring across buildings with a wide range of functions, public and private, so all in all the associations of these features had become much wider than grotto recall.[44] Even earlier, elaborate rooms were already being built which in other respects looked like typical fountain rooms, but did not actually contain water. The room at the Villa Sant'Antonio, Tivoli is a good example, which nonetheless is still regularly and confusingly cited as an example of a nymphaeum.[45] With their regular and formal layout, wholly artificial construction, and complete absence of water, the desirability of these rooms can no longer be simply explained as grotto inspired.[46]

The use(s) to which these water-containing rooms were put can usually only be inferred. The presence of the water would be cooling and the sound of splashing agreeable. The niches could house statues or surface pictures. Often the side opposite to the watery end was open, with a view to a garden, the sea, or some other pleasant view.[47] Occasionally permanent couches provide unequivocal evidence of a dining

---

[43] Letzner 1999 Cat.112. Lavagne 1988 381-2 sees this as a very early example of his subject of study, the grotto, and it may indeed be an early example of the fertilisation of the functional fountain room with grotto motifs.

[44] Tamm 1963 147ff, looking for the origins of the apsed hall, finds pre-Domitianic examples not just in 'nymphaea' (meaning fountain rooms) but in baths, temples, other official and public structures and in private houses where the use of water is not involved. Although she too believes the early history of the apse is most strongly associated with 'nymphaea' and 'musaea', her list of examples illustrates that the application of the building forms was much more widespread by the first century AD.

[45] Giuliani's painstaking re-examination of the building (Giuliani 1970 299 No. 207) has established that the only evidence of pipes relates to groundwater drainage. The large, rectangular, barrel-vaulted room has a rear apse, niched walls with pilasters on spurs, and mosaic decoration including shells. Letzner 1999 Cat.178 for full bibliography.

[46] Neuerburg 1965 does also note (44-45) that there are also fountain rooms without any specific grotto allusions, where paint and stucco were used in ways typical of non-fountain rooms, and suggests the sacellum as another source of inspiration.

[47] The two rooms at Formia were part of a long series open to the sea (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.57 and 58, and Guaitoli and Giuliani 1972). The room in the House of Julia Felix looked out into an elaborate peristyle garden with more water (Rakob 1964). The view from the (non fountain) room at Sant'Antonio was of the great cascade at Tivoli.

function.[48] Pompeii VI 17 Ins.Occ.42 is a particularly fine example, combining step niche fountain and high quality mosaic at the rear of the room with permanent dining couches, looking out onto a garden, and another elaborate pool.[49] Sometimes the water was obviously contained within the back end of the room, leaving a clear open space in front available for various uses[50] but conversely, occasionally, the water basin filled the whole room, rendering it useless for any form of occupation.[51]

4.2.3 Comparisons for the Villa

Fountain rooms had a clear and common presence in villas and to a lesser extent in town houses[52] before the time of Hadrian but the surviving examples from imperial dwellings deserve closer attention. A hundred years before Hadrian there was a fountain room at Punta Epitaffio, already mentioned in the context of the grotto, probably belonging to the imperial family, which despite its elaborate surface and sculptural decoration was structurally a barrel-vaulted rectangular fountain room with a rear extension and permanent dining couches (Fig.128).[53] Part of the Bagni di Livia suite on the Palatine consisted of two barrel-vaulted fountain rooms, one with a rear extension, one without (Fig.135.1, A^3 and A^4). Both had a water cascade descending in a niche in the rear wall. They were richly decorated (no pumice or shells so far as we can tell) but the suite centred on a dining area and the main view from that dining area was the façade fountain, not these flanking rooms.[54] The fountain room brought fully to light in the 1950s in the Esquiline wing of the Domus Aurea (and usually numbered 45 on modern plans, Fig.138) caused great excitement and has been much discussed both for its architecture[55] and especially its figured mosaic ceiling

---

[48] For example the House of Julia Felix (Rakob 1964); Punta Epitaffio (Sciarelli 1983); Minori (Bencivenga et al. 1979, though the permanent couches are dated to the Severan renovation 246ff).
[49] Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.313.
[50] For example Pompeii VIII 2 28 where the water fell down steps at the rear of the room into an elaborate full width but narrow basin, leaving the front part of the room free (roughly 5 x 4m), with a very large window in the front wall (Letzner 1999 Cat.123).
[51] Letzner 1999 130 suggests this was common, but in fact there are few examples and in many cases, due to incomplete exploration of the floor, we simply do not know how water flowing from the rear or sides was gathered or disposed of. The location of a water-filled room like Letzner 1999 Cat.48, inserted in a row of tabernae fronting the House of the Mosaic Columns at Pompeii, strongly suggests a water drawing, rather than a decorative, function.
[52] There are only 3 examples from Pompeii – the house of Julia Felix, VI 17 Ins.Occ. 42 and VIII 2 28. There are no clear early examples from Ostia. The example at Ninfeo Cat.7 in Vol. 2 of Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 is neither clearly dated nor clearly a fountain room.
[53] The most thorough description of the whole set up is still Sciarelli 1983.
[54] The space between the columns surrounding the dining area were widened in front of these rooms, presumably to improve the view from the dining area into those rooms and their cascades.
[55] Zander 1958 remains fundamental; Ball 1994 is a thorough re-examination of the structural issues.

decoration.[56] However, when set in the context of fountain rooms more generally, the design and general appearance of the room, with its barrel-vaulted roof, no rear extension or apse in this case, niched walls, single water step cascade, extensive use of pumice, and its axial connection through the adjoining room 44 to a garden, would not have been strikingly different to large and older fountain room examples from elsewhere, leaving aside the appearance of the mosaic tondos in the vault.[57] Its importance in the overall design of the Domus Aurea, much of which is still unknown to us, may also sometimes be overestimated.[58]

There are three known fountain rooms on the Palatine. The detail of the features and decoration of the twin rooms in the Domus Augustana upper level (Fig.132, rooms either side of no.20) is not clear,[59] but their position in the hierarchy of rooms in the area is clearer. They form part of a numerous and broadly symmetrical suite of rooms which on this side has an aspect looking out to the peristyle with the large pool. The fountain rooms do not occupy the dominant position within the suite, and though they are open to the peristyle, they are not on the main axis of the pool, but flank the semicircular construction, which is. They are larger than the Domus Aurea fountain room,[60] but, like all the rooms in this suite, much smaller than the vast halls which cluster round the adjoining peristyle with the maze pool.[61] The usual interpretation of this whole area is that it was part of the more private area of the palace (usually termed the Domus Augustana), as compared to the large-scale public reception areas (usually termed the Domus Flavia).[62] Very little has ever been published about the fountain room overlooking the Circus Maximus[63] though here at least it is stated that the water flowed into a basin apparently occupying the whole of the rear extension.

---

[56] Lavagne 1988 583ff is a good starting point with further bibliography.

[57] For example the larger fountain room at Formia (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.57). I cannot follow Lavagne in so far as he sees this as the first occurrence of the grotto within the dwelling, rather than perched at its extremities or isolated, and even he acknowledges that the tri-partite arrangement of garden-peristyle, dining room, and nymphaeum is also clearly recognisable at Pompeii, at not dissimilar dates (Lavagne 1988 580-581).

[58] The other, disappeared, surface and sculptural decoration may of course have been novel and notably costly. The one room which Suetonius' description (*Nero* 31) singles out is the famous *circular* (my emphasis) dining room with the revolving roof – a room which (if it really existed) would truly be as remarkable a structure as this room is unremarkable, in the broader context of rooms found in villas.

[59] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.178 remains the fundamental description.

[60] Approximately 12 x 8m (excluding rear extensions) as compared to about 8 x 8m.

[61] Fig.132 5 Aula Regia 28 x 37m and Fig.132 13 Triclinium 26 x 30m, approximately.

[62] For example MacDonald 1982 49 uses the terms private palace (Augustana) and official palace (Flavia).

[63] Again, Neuerburg 1965 is fundamental but does not provide a plan or even any measurements of the room. From the photograph, it appears to have much the same size and proportions as the twin rooms

There was, perhaps, a fountain room in Nero's villa at Subiaco[64] and two at Castel Gandolfo, alternating in a row with semicircular fountain rooms,[65] but none of these have survived well or are well documented.[66] Finally, there is a fountain room at the villa at Altipiani di Arcinazzo which possibly belonged to Trajan. At the rear of the room, a three niche curved fountain wall with a basin occupying the whole of the floor fronted onto a large rectangular room open to a peristyle.[67]

The evidence of the imperial dwellings appears to suggest, then, that the rectangular fountain rooms which had already been constructed for around 200 years were, around the turn of the 2nd century AD, taking subsidiary roles, and other types of fountain and pool structure occurred more frequently and in locations which were as, or more, dominant.[68] Nonetheless they continued to be built in the long established styles well into the second century – the most unequivocal example in a prestigious location is the so called Grotto of Egeria which is said to be Hadrianic or Antonine, and probably belonged to the villa of Herodes Attikos on the Appian Way.[69] It consisted of a barrel-vaulted room roughly 9 x 7m, with three niches in each sidewall, and a rectangular rear extension containing a reclining water god. The water emerged beneath the god into a basin and ran away into canals along the walls. The decoration included mosaic in the niches, pumice in the vault, and marble facings on walls and floor.[70]

4.2.4 Examples at the Villa

With this background it is not surprising to find that three of the five identifiable examples at the Villa of this kind of water structure pre-date the Hadrianic building programme. How and, to some extent, why they were incorporated in the Hadrianic

---

on the upper level (not accessible October 2001). This part of the Palatine has not been fully published and the connection between it and the main buildings is unclear.

[64] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.219, Letzner 1999 Cat.375.

[65] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.75.

[66] Although the Ninfeo Dorico at Castel Gandolfo, which is a Republican structure, is regularly included in catalogues (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.76, Letzner 1999 Cat.19) and accounts of the development of 'nymphaea', I have been unable to form a clear impression of how the water, if any, functioned here.

[67] Letzner 1999 Cat.381 with earlier bibliography. Both Letzner 1999 and Neuerburg 1965 classify this as an 'esedra' fountain but the published plans (both authors only reproduce and discuss the back wall) suggest rather that it was the rear wall of a large fountain room. Only one section of the villa, plus terracing walls, has been explored and published.

[68] Chapter 5 cites, for example, numerous examples of pools inside and outside buildings, some very large and with complex interior constructions.

[69] Tobin 1997 369ff.

[70] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.81; Letzner 1999 Cat.36 has some later bibliography.

Villa is discussed at 2.5 and here I will say a little more about the Fountain under the Doric Temple (Cat.1 R1, Fig.6) because the filling of the entire room with water is most unusual. The evidence tends to suggest that this was a Hadrianic alteration. There is no recorded evidence of any structure or shelter in front of the room, but there could have been trees or other shade provision which has left no trace, so that the old room was utilised as a resting place on a promenade through the grounds of the Villa (as suggested broadly by Lavagne). Yet the filling of the whole room and especially the inclusion of steps were not necessary in order to fulfil this purpose. The steps are strongly suggestive of bathing. Close by the fountain room and between it and the area occupied by the Northern Ruins (between 3 and 4 on Fig.1) there are a number of Hadrianic buildings which are very poorly known. It may be that they had some functional connection with the fountain room.[71]

The two Hadrianic fountain rooms at the Villa are very different to each other. The room under the East Belvedere (Cat.1 H3 Figs 28-30), at first glance a 'typical' fountain room, in fact has some very unusual features. It is square and tall in proportion to its plan and the barrel vault goes across the room rather than towards the rear wall. The front wall is not open but closed, though the room would have been relatively well lit by large windows, now partly blocked. There is only one very large niche and pumice appears to have covered virtually all the surfaces, not just the vault, though the corbels on the rear wall may have supported some kind of architectural framing. In design and decoration it is a very simple fountain room yet the large features and bold use of pumice make it one of the most striking rooms to survive at the Villa. The idea that the room served as some sort of shrine to Hercules (see Cat.2 C4), prompted in part by the reported find of a statue fragment here or nearby, in part by the association of Hercules and Tivoli, and in part by other shrines to Hercules with grotto-like features, is supported indirectly by the differences between this and other fountain rooms. The complete disconnection between it and the core parts of the Villa on the upper levels make it hard to visualise as a dining room or as having any practical use as formal or informal living or working area.

---

[71] There are several preserved immediately adjacent rooms, one with the fine stucco ceiling discussed in the catalogue entry which has often been misattributed to the fountain room. Close by, separate, but clearly once connected to other unknown buildings is the 'Casina degli Architetti', whose restoration is described at Adriano 2000 176. The author is unable to suggest a use for this building but notes that it may have had some water function. Other modern authors have not discussed the function of these rooms.

The fountain room on the north side of the Residence (Cat.1 H9, Figs.40 and 45), though little of it remains, seems much closer to the usual fountain room pattern. With its open south wall, probably looking out onto a garden, latrines and symmetrical side rooms, it looks very much like a triclinium with associated retiring rooms. By Villa standards this is not a large room (roughly 10 x 7m, height not preserved).[72] If it served as a dining room, it was a relatively small and intimate one,[73] though of course its decoration may none the less have been rich (so little remains that it is impossible to make a comparison with say the Domus Aurea fountain room). It is very close to the Fountain stibadium Cat.1 H8 (they are O and T on Fig.40), which again is small scale, and it is tempting to view them as a summer/winter dining pair. MacDonald and Pinto 1995[74] think that this suite - together with immediately adjacent buildings such as the Heliocaminus Baths, the library and the Fountain stibadium at the south corner should be viewed as the imperial private apartment. Yet as their work makes clear, the Emperor had a choice of 'private spaces' and small scale dining areas, even so far as we can identify them.[75] The appearance and context of this room is consistent with the relatively minor role that fountain rooms of simple form had come to play in imperial dwellings.

4.3 Cavea shapes

4.3.1 Background

There are two clear examples from the Villa of water features whose characteristics are that they are open air, and that they assume the shape of a theatre cavea with water running down all or part of steps which are like seats, with the water collecting in a basin in the area of the 'orchestra'.[76] The structures are the fountain in the east corner of the Residence (Cat.1 R5) and the structure at the south end of the Stadium Garden (Cat.1 H12). This may have been 'a witty transposition engineered by the imperial

---

[72] Though larger than fountain rooms such as the one under the Doric Temple and on the north side of the Residence Quadrangle.
[73] Bek 1983 83 suggests that the space needed for a triclinium, set out in the usual way, is 4 x 4m. This room would accommodate this arrangement and leave space in front for small-scale entertainment; alternatively the slightly curved rear wall could accommodate a stibadium.
[74] Macdonald and Pinto 1995 35.
[75] There was also the Island Enclosure, the possibly heated upper areas in the Fountain Court Buildings, and the certainly heated upper areas of the Peristyle Pool Building.
[76] Neuerburg 1965 57 includes this type within his 'esedra semicircolare.' Letzner 1999 152 distinguishes as type 8A and I think the features are distinct enough to merit treating it as a separate category.

architect', but as we will see, it was not a new idea.[77] Although the shape may be inspired by theatre design the viewpoint is reversed – the 'audience' looks up and towards the cavea, where they would normally be seated looking down and out. The resemblance to a cavea is strong and the popularity of all kinds of theatrical references is evident generally in Roman art and architecture,[78] but another attraction was probably the opportunity to use water steps, which feature prominently in many kinds of Roman fountains (6.2) in an extensive way.

4.3.2 Precedents

If there is no extant clear evidence of water, this type of fountain can be hard to distinguish from the small theatre which might also form part of a major villa[79] and there are disagreements about the nature of several structures. However the evidence suggests that the type significantly predates Hadrian's Villa and there is a link with villas and maybe imperial property.[80]

The clearest comparisons are with the so-called Auditorium of Maecenas in Rome (Fig.134.1) and with a structure at modern Posillipo in Naples. The Auditorium is a large room (10.6m wide, 24.4 at its longest) with niches decorated with garden paintings. A 7-step cavea shaped fountain occupied the north short end.[81] Though several phases have been identified the basic structure predates the Villa by perhaps 150 years. What happened to the water after it ran down the steps remains unclear.[82]

---

[77] Ehrlich 1989 169.

[78] Varro's aviary included a stepped arrangement which is specifically described as theatre-like seating for birds (*De re rustica* 3.5.13) – here the birds and their movement replace the people. Ginouvès 1969 161f on the relationship between fountain design and the theatre, especially 163 n.4 on cavea types, though he mentions structures which do not contain steps and/or fountains. Paris 1990 covers theatrical motifs more generally.

[79] A point made in reverse by Mielsch 1999 109, who is trying to recognise theatres.

[80] No similar structures, even on a smaller scale, are preserved in any town location that I am aware of.

[81] Vespignani and Visconti 1874 remains fundamental since it contains details of the original find condition. The later discovery of pipe holes in the top of the steps is remarked inter alia at Neuerburg 1965 Cat.149 and Fig 72 ('recent'). However some publications continue to reflect earlier views of the structure as an auditorium, or of the steps as locations for plant pots (for example Coarelli 1981 238). Plant pots could of course have been combined with trickling water.

[82] It is sometimes suggested that a canal ran down the middle of the room, the evidence for which has been buried by 19th century floor restoration (for example by De Vos 1983 231). Yet there are no signs of a canal in the excavation reports and illustrations, and the two layers of floor still visible (mosaic followed by opus sectile) appear to run all the way across the room in front of the steps. The pipe holes were blocked at some point, possibly in connection with the building of a wall across the bottom of the steps (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.149). A connection to or derivation from the grotto of Matromania on Capri – a natural cave with some constructed elements - and the Auditorium (Ginouvès 1969 163 n.4 and Lavagne 1988 563) – seems far-fetched.

It was roofed, probably by a barrel vault[83] and current thinking is that it served as a cool triclinium.[84]

At Posillipo a small theatre and an odeion (very similar in size to the cavea structure) nearby make it very unlikely that the adjacent stepped structure had any auditorium function. The structure is in a very bad condition[85] but consists of a peristyle (measuring approximately 30 x 52m at its longest) with a 3-step hemicycle at the north short end. The peristyle may be a reference to the porticoed area commonly found with a theatre, [86] and if so only the scaenae frons is missing from the ensemble. The evidence for water is somewhat confused. Günther 1913 reports only two narrow water channels, painted and plastered, running from the hemicycle round the other three sides of the peristyle.[87] The date is Augustan or Tiberian.[88]

The extensive remains at Posillipo are confidently identified with the property of Vedius Pollio (Pausilypon) which passed to Augustus in 15BC and remained imperial property at least until the time of Hadrian.[89] The Horti Maecenati in which the Auditorium was located passed to Augustus on Maecenas' death and appear to have remained imperial property at least up to the time of Nero.[90]

The nature of some other similar structures is less clear. One of the best known archaeologically is an Augustan structure from the Third Winter Palace at Jericho where a long niched wall was interrupted by a recessed hemicycle with four low steps and a canal running around the edge at the bottom. Although a stairway interrupts the steps, it may not have been a cascade since there were no signs of sides to stop the water flowing off sideways. Planting pots were found still embedded in the steps.[91] At Baiae the 'Baths of Sosandra' are treated as a cavea type fountain by Neuerburg

---

[83] Favoured by the on-site literature for example.
[84] For example De Vos 1983.
[85] Thus Günther 51-55, although old, is fundamental but even he had difficulty with the overgrown condition, previous rock falls, and modern building.
[86] At Rome for example, the Crypta Balbi with the Theatrum Balbi; the Theatrum and Porticus Pompeii.
[87] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.44 talks of canals round the two lower steps, not referenced by Günther; Letzner 1999 Cat.261 hypothesises a euripus in the garden.
[88] Neuerburg 1965; other parts of the villa date from the late Republic to the late 1st century AD.
[89] D'Arms 1970 Cat.2 No. 44.
[90] Evidence for ownership is not clear, Richardson 1992 Horti Maecenatiani summarises. By the mid 2nd century AD, at least part of them had apparently passed to Fronto (*Ad.M.Caes.* 1.8.5).
[91] Kelso and Baramki 1949

1965 and Letzner 1999[92] but with no real evidence of water on the steps. At Bacoli Maiuri A 1955's proposal that the 'Sepolcro di Agrippina' was originally an auditorium later converted to a fountain is dismissed by Neuerburg as speculation, but accepted by others.[93] On the island of Pianosa there is a cavea like structure interrupted at top centre by a 'box'. It has not been examined in detail since the 19th century. It seems more likely that this was a place for recitals but the steps are very narrow.[94] At the villa of Domitian at Circeo there is a poorly understood semicircular structure with radial walls which might be a place for recitals or a fountain.[95] Finally, there is what might be a theatre or a fountain from Sorrento (disappeared).[96]

4.3.3 The relationship with hippodrome, circus or stadium gardens

At the Villa, the cavea fountain was used as the terminus – and a very appropriate one given the occurrence of built steps at the curved ends of stadia and similar sports arenas - in a stadium-like structure, Hoffman's 'Stadium Garden'.[97] However, that does not establish that the cavea fountain originally derives from sporting rather than theatrical models. Hoffmann 1980, Gieré, Humphrey and Förtsch 1993, who are looking for examples of stadium-type gardens earlier than Domitian's on the Palatine, argue this to some extent.[98]

Built theatres were of course much more prominent and regularly occurring models in Italy, especially before the 1st century AD, than the built hippodrome, circus or stadium (henceforth all called stadium for convenience). Notwithstanding the comments of these writers, there is little resemblance between Posillipo and a stadium

---

[92] Cat.47 and 259 respectively. The whole complex lacks full publication. The pool in the area of the orchestra is circular and only occupies a small proportion of the space.
[93] Neuerburg 1965 57. For example Letzner 1999 Cat.257; Borriello and D'Ambrosio 1979 102 No.90.
[94] Romizzi 2001 Cat.28 gives various references but all the information basically derives from Chierici 1875 (not seen). New work by Cambi, said by Romizzi to be in course of printing, also not seen.
[95] Lugli 1928 71 No. 11.
[96] Mingazzini and Pfister 1946 104 No. 23. Letzner includes a wall from San Marco in his Cat.8A list, but there is no evidence of steps there, nor that it is a fountain wall (see n.22 above) and Fig.130.1 62-65). La Rocca 1986 27 (also LTUR III 63) notes in the Horti Lamiani in Rome a huge structure of which very little is known, with concentric walls linked by radial spurs. He links this architecturally (n.230) to the structures at the Auditorium of Maecenas, Posillipo, Bacoli, and Baiae, and Anguillara Sabazia (the last not though a stepped construction) but full details of the Horti Lamiani structure, including those of any water element, have never been properly published.
[97] These gardens are discussed further at 7.3.1.
[98] Humphrey 1986 571 n.117 suggests Posillipo as a precursor to Domitian's Hippodrome on the Palatine. Gieré 1986 uses it as an example of a hippodrome garden (his Cat.3). Förtsch 1993 cites Posillipo as a circus garden (Cat.VI 41) and Hoffmann 1980 66 cites Posillipo as a precedent for the Palatine construction.

type. In particular, the proportions are quite wrong – the Posillipo structure is almost square, not long and thin, and the open porticoed area resembles, as suggested above, the colonnades attached to theatres. I think it is unlikely that it is a precedent for gardens modelled on a stadium (or similar), as described by Pliny or recognisable on the Palatine (none of which actually contained stepped constructions). The other cavea fountain examples given above are not positioned as the termini of long thin gardens either. In particular the Auditorium fountain was the terminus of a (square rather than long and thin) roofed room – the indoor nature recalls, as the name suggests, covered theatrical seating, not a sports arena.

In summary, I think the stepped cavea shape fountain appears separately from, and earlier than, stadium-type gardens, but it was included in the Villa at the Stadium Garden, as well as in a complex of, as we shall see, non stadium-proportions (Cat.1 R5).

4.3.4 The Villa examples

The dating of the fountain in the east corner of the Residence (Cat.1 R5, Fig.13 et seq.) and whether it was a fountain in a Republican phase has been much debated.[99] Taking the structural evidence first, Lugli 1927 saw evidence of three pre-Hadrianic phases – first containment walls, then a cistern, then a cavea fountain. For the third pre-Hadrianic phase, his Tav. II identifies opus quasi-reticulatum all around the low basin and his text says it was plastered and painted blue (Fig.15.2). However Salza Prina Ricotti, accepting that there are fragments of early walls in the area, explains them entirely as containment walls and earlier cisterns (for agricultural use).[100] She believes the fragments of blue plaster postdate the Hadrianic marble lining, and does not comment otherwise on the date and nature of the underlying wall.[101]

---

[99] Lugli 1927 194-8; Tav. II 'O'. Neuerburg Cat.197 and Letzner 1999 Cat.263 both support a Republican fountain and a substantial Hadrianic re working. On the other hand Crema 1959 122 only references a Republican 'esedra'. Blake and Taylor 1973 have 'A Republican exedra....converted into a nymphaeum by inserting pipes in the concrete mass which would allow water to cascade into a pool at the bottom of the slope, only to reappear again in two fountains with circular pools'.
[100] Most recently Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 361.
[101] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 365. Her argument is not followed for example by Guidobaldi 1994 225 commenting on his structure NP9, who like Lugli thinks the plaster predates the marble and is probably Republican.

It seems to me, with Lugli, that the walls of the semicircular basin are opus quasi reticulatum, not Hadrianic, and that the shape and height of the basin are consistent with it being surrounded by a cavea shape at the time it was built. The location of cramp marks in the wall at locations unspecified by Salza Prina Ricotti is not conclusive of the order in which marble and painted plaster was put on the wall. The marble could have been put in place after the original plaster or parts of it, were taken off, or fell off. It seems unlikely those who removed the marble facings, which almost certainly was after Hadrian, would have bothered to re-plaster and paint the basin and there are no signs of this kind of reinstatement taking place elsewhere where marble was removed.

There is clear evidence, outlined above, of similar constructions which significantly predate Hadrian, from the Auditorium of Maecenas, Posillipo and indeed Jericho and thus another of Salza Prina Ricotti's arguments, that the fountain echoes the design and therefore the date of the Stadium Garden, is invalid.[102] A cavea-shaped Augustan or Republican fountain in the older part of the Villa would fit with this series and date although the use of planting beds rather than water for decoration at this stage cannot be ruled out. Therefore it seems most probable that here Hadrian took an existing open-air cavea shape and reworked the area around it. By analogy with Posillipo, there may have been an open peristyle originally in front of the fountain. Under Hadrian, the proportions of the whole of complex (Fig.13), and the complete lack of any features in the central area recalling the central areas of stadia and the like, argue against it having been designed with a stadium or similar in mind.

Under Hadrian the other features of this complex suggest certain possibilities for usage. The entrance block (Fig.13.1 H) with its semicircular room, columnar screen, opus sectile floor and latrines, strongly suggests a possible dining use with a view out towards the fountain.[103] The juxtaposition of monumental architecture and expensive high quality marble flooring in the vestibule with the cheaper opus spicatum used for the open courtyard between the entrance and the fountain is curious and unique in the Villa, so far as we are aware. Elsewhere opus spicatum is used for minor rooms and

---

[102] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 361 and earlier publications.

[103] The diameter of a stibadium placed there would be about 10m - not dissimilar to rooms with masonry stibadia (Scenic Triclinium 13m, Fountain stibadium10m. Stibadia in the covered hemicycles of the water feature next to the Water Court and the closed complex south east of the Scenic Triclinium would be about 12m and 10m.). See further discussion at 7.5.3.

exercise areas.[104] Then there are the oval structures set in the courtyard (Figs.13.1 and 14.2). The most consistent and convincing hypothesis at present, in the absence of any evidence of water being piped to them, is that they were in fact planting basins for trees.[105] Perhaps these trees were even part of the original lay out of the area in front of the fountain and were retained in the Hadrianic reworking. As trees would inevitably drop leaves and twigs the opus spicatum was not just a more informal but also a more practical surface for sweeping away (or absorbing less obviously) dirt and debris. In this interpretation the view from the dining area would be of the cavea fountain (whose condition is too decayed to indicate what combination of water and planting was used) and possibly of trees in the oval structures, which are however placed so as not to obstruct the main line of sight. This view can be glimpsed approaching the main door (Fig.14.1) and opens out as the visitor enters (Fig.14.2). Around the trees, in their shade, a closer view of the waterworks might be enjoyed from 'outdoors'.

The design of the cavea fountain at the south end of the Stadium Garden (Figs.57-59) is both clearer and very probably more sophisticated than the Residence cavea fountain.[106] The upper structure with steps, cascades and rocky planting beds is complex and would have been colourful. Although the idea of a circus or stadium or hippodrome-shaped garden – that is a long thin shape with a curved end or ends – is well attested in the literary and archaeological record, it is clear that the elements which inhabited the basic shape were far from fixed and might, or might not, refer to various elements contained within a real structure (see 7.3.1). This use of a cavea-style fountain at one end is not repeated elsewhere, so far as we know. It may also be viewed as the application or extension (literally) of another existing idea – that of the stepped construction adjoined to a peristyle - an idea which seems to predate the appearance of stadium or similar gardens in the archaeological and literary records. The steps here refer to stadium, rather than theatre seating.

In this rendition of the cavea fountain there is another addition - the barrel vaulted room at the bottom which was clearly intended to be viewed both as the focal point of

---

[104] For example the palaestrae in the Large and Small Baths. Exercise at Cat.1 R5 in a restricted area interrupted by the oval structures is unlikely.
[105] Advanced, for example by Giuliani 1988 88.
[106] Indirect evidence of an earlier date for the latter. If the Residence structure were not a source of ideas, the Auditorium of Maecenas and Posillipo were both structures, as imperial property, which might have been personally known to Hadrian.

the long axial view through the whole complex and close up from the walkway round the semicircular pool (Fig.56.2). This hooded and water-filled room is not reminiscent of any theatrical feature but it does have features in common with fountain rooms and grottoes. Its importation demonstrates how far the cavea fountain has moved from its theatrical inspiration and the willingness at the Villa to 'mix and match' watery elements to achieve novel effects. The use to which the whole Stadium Garden was put is a much more complex question which is addressed at 7.3.

4.4 Fountain walls

4.4.1 Background

There are at the Villa several fountain structures which I have called fountain walls and their characteristics are:

- rear wall may be flat or curved
- pool(s) in front
- decorated with multiple niches
- single storey.

I include here the Fountain wall adjoining the Small Baths (Cat.1 H13), the Upper Park Wall (Cat.1 H19), the Cistern Fountain (Cat.1 R2), the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure (Cat.1 H5), and the Fountain stibadium (Cat.1 H8). The 5-niche wall fountain at the Water Court and the fountain wall behind the stibadium at the Scenic Triclinium also fall within this group, but they are discussed in more detail in Chapter 7 which deals with the large complex features. The Water feature adjoining the Water Court (Cat.1 H15) does not quite fit within this group because there was, so far as we can tell, no water in the wall but only in the pool which was out in the open air (Fig.75 Q). This feature is discussed in 7.5.3 and the unusual shaped pool at 5.2. The Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H18) is another feature close to but not quite within this category, as there was only water in a rear extension to a niched wall, and this is considered in the context of the Scenic Triclinium at 7.5.3.

My grouping of flat and curved fountain walls together cuts across the normal fountain typologies which distinguish the curved wall (esedra) from the flat (facciata).[107] I do not think, as discussed next, that the distinction stands up to analysis, and the difficulty of applying the distinction at the Villa is demonstrated by the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure, which has a slightly curved rear wall and is classed by Neuerburg 1965 as 'esedra' and Letzner 1999 as 'facciata.' They agree that the Cistern Fountain is facciata and the Fountain stibadium esedra. Neuerburg 1965 (and Letzner 1999 who has followed Neuerburg's list of Villa features without amendment) did not recognise either the wall of the Upper Park Wall, nor the wall adjoining the Small Baths, as fountains.

4.4.2 Esedra and facciata

Traditionally these have been distinguished in form and origin. The curved type is said to derive from the grotto. The flat type is said to derive from functional fountain buildings and, often, to have a particular relationship too with the architecture of the theatrical scaenae frons, even though multi-storey and architecturally highly elaborate façades are found equally in the curved types especially in public structures.[108] Most writers though, even if they believe in the distinction of origins as well as forms, see that the true picture is far more complex, especially by the mid empire.[109] Cross fertilisation of the flat and curved forms of fountain wall is evident in some structures by the mid 1st century AD and this suggests, as discussed in other contexts, that in general the kind of precise typological distinctions favoured by cataloguers were not perceived by fountain designers at this time. The wall of the Bagni di Livia suite (Fig.135.1) is a good example of the mixing of the two 'types'.[110] The upper, rear part is a lightly curved niched wall with a cascade in the middle – in the fountain catalogue

---

[107] Neuerburg 1965 distinguishes 'esedra' from 'facciata'. Letzner 1999 has Types 6, 7 and 15 as his main 'esedra' classes, and 9 and 10 his 'facciata'.

[108] For example Neuerburg 1965 28-9 summarises his view of the differing origins of the types; Lavagne 1990 134 also expresses this differentiation. Multi-storey structures were particularly popular and suitable for the display of honorary or dynastic subjects in public contexts – these structures and purposes are outside the scope of this research but are discussed briefly at 4.4.6.

[109] Ginouvès 1969 165 for example still sees elements of the grotto in the decoration chosen for fountains 'à fond plat,' contrary to their supposed theatrical origins. Parra 1976 finds there is no evidence that the forms of some fountains derived directly from theatre models, rather that the flat types and the scaenae frontes were sharing the same architectural vocabulary with other types of buildings and the appearance of curved forms in 'ninfei' predates their appearance in the architecture of the theatre. She suggests in fact that appearance of the rounded forms of niches and esedrae in theatres derives from 'ninfei', so if anything the influence works the other way round (97 and 106ff particularly).

[110] Neuerburg 1965 categorises this wall as a ninfeo a facciata; Letzner 1999 202 as one of his esedrae Type 7 – presumably basing this classification only on the upper, curved, part of the structure.

typologies 'curve' and 'cascade' would normally be taken to refer to grotto. Below it is a straight wall, enlivened by niches and spouts, finishing with a basin – this element is often referred to as 'theatrical'.[111] Similarly, the Neronian fountain wall, forming originally part of the Domus Aurea, along the east side of the platform of the Temple of Divus Claudius, 167m long, was essentially a flat wall but broken up by very substantial indentations including curved esedrae up to 10m wide.[112]

Another issue with the standard categorisations is that they do not distinguish covered from uncovered structures.[113] Often, of course, there is no direct evidence for roofing but it may be implied from the presence or absence of projecting sidewalls which would support a roof. Flat fountain walls rarely provide shelter but where a curved wall is associated with a roof it provides shelter and, depending on the extent and shape of the pool (an area where we are again often poorly informed), the possibility that the fountain can be occupied and used in effect as a room. This seems to me, where it can be ascertained, to be an important point of distinction between one kind of fountain structure and another, and more important in terms of role and uses than whether the wall is curved or flat.

4.4.3 Characteristics of flat fountain walls

If we can put to one side, for the time being, ideas about origins and relationship to the scaenae frons, which are not in any event very revealing about functional questions, the use and features of flat fountain walls in Italy in residential situations up to the time of Hadrian show certain characteristics.

They tend to appear [114] as single storey decoration of a flat wall which has another purpose. The wall might be a terrace substructure,[115] a cistern,[116] or a garden wall.[117]

---

[111] For example Letzner 1999 Cat.247. Ginouvès 1969 143-44 sees 'grotto' at the top and 'theatre' at the bottom.
[112] How much of this façade used water is still not clear – for example whether the esedrae were filled with water or not (Letzner 1999 Cat.284 for bibliography).
[113] Neuerburg 1965 and Letzner 1999 do not distinguish covered from uncovered esedrae. This is perhaps a product of heavy reliance on plan as a tool of categorisation.
[114] Of course poor excavation records or destruction of the area around means that many have lost their original context.
[115] The Divus Claudius wall referred to in 4.4.2, the Bibliotheca Hertziana façade (Letzner 1999 Cat.282) which only had water in its second phase.
[116] Lanuvio, San Lorenzo (Letzner 1999 Cat.321). There are more examples in the public sphere: Formia (Via Appia) Letzner 1999 Cat.313; Palestrina (Via degli Arcioni) Letzner 1999 Cat.275;

They are not, usually, freestanding and they are not very common.[118] Most substructures, cisterns and garden walls were not however decorated with fountains,[119] though they might have decoration that looked like that of a fountain.[120] Even in dwellings, flat fountain walls could be of considerable length, where length was not dictated by the width of a small garden or cistern. 167m long (Temple of Divus Claudius) was quite exceptional but several others 20m or more in length are known.[121]

Neuerburg takes the view[122] that fountain walls (at least those attached to cisterns) did not really appear until the Empire and it certainly seems that they were not as numerous, in the early days, as fountain rooms, in dwellings. However as the examples given have shown, the design existed in dwellings during the 1st century AD. It is a little surprising that cistern fountains do not appear earlier and more numerously given that cisterns existed, and elaborating a point of supply there seems an obvious step.

Taormina (Naumachia) Letzner 1999 Cat.285. The dating for the last is usually now taken as Trajanic rather than Neuerburg 1965's 2nd/3rd century AD.

[117] Pompeii VI 10 7 (Letzner 1999 Cat.274); Pompeii V 1 7 (Andersson 1990); Rome Porta San Lorenzo (Letzner 1999 Cat.292) – though it is not clear what evidence the excavators saw of a garden. The Bagni di Livia wall was the terminus of a view across a paved courtyard from a triclinium. The fountain wall at Brescia (Letzner 1999 Cat.293 and George 1997 43f) fronted an open area, or garden.

[118] The two examples above of garden walls with fountains at Pompeii are the only two fountain walls so far uncovered from a very large number of gardens there. Only one example of a fountain wall dated 2nd century AD or earlier has been clearly identified so far at Ostia (Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 Vol.2 Ninfeo Cat.14).

[119] Substructures without elaboration are visible in innumerable platform villas – the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii is a clear and complete example. Cisterns of course may not be built up but wholly or partly buried.

[120] The niched garden wall at the House of Julia Felix had painted pumice decoration exactly similar to that of the facing fountain room. At Pompeii VI 7 23 (House of Apollo) a garden wall decorated with 3 niches (including mosaic) had pumice above, marble below and half columns decorated with shells and mosaic, but no water (well described and illustrated at Zanker 1998 156ff). Letzner 1999 Cat,280 includes the high wall of a garden, found in Via XX Settembre, decorated extensively with mosaic pictures (also shells)but there is no clear evidence of decorative waterworks (De Vos 1997 57ff).

[121] A mosaic wall from Massalubrense at least 20m (not in the catalogues, Borriello 1996 143ff; Sampaolo 1995); Bibliotheca Hertziana 35m, where the first water works have plausibly been dated after 19BC and before Tiberius (Letzner 1999 Cat.282); Capua 18m (Letzner 1999 Cat.296); House of Valerius Vegetes 8 niches (Letzner 1999 Cat.295); Porta San Lorenzo 8 or 10 niches (Letzner 1999 Cat.292); House of Avidius Quietus maybe 40m (according to the excavators report, Neuerburg 1965 Cat.163). In this case the fountain wall also went round a corner. All these examples are from private dwellings, so far as we can tell.

[122] Neuerburg 1965 74. Letzner 1999 takes much the same view though he subdivides his Type 9 differently. Ginouvès 1969 156 thinks the numbers were limited. Neuerburg 1965 81 suggests that the 'a camera', 'esedra' and 'facciata' types were equally popular, though he appears to be making a generalisation without regard to degrees of popularity at different times.

4.4.4 Covered curved fountain walls functioning as rooms

In most cases, semicircular basins occupied the whole of the central floor area in front of a curved fountain wall[123] and in these cases there was no possibility of the wall creating a space which could be occupied. There are other examples where no evidence of the pool has actually been found or recorded. Letzner 1999 notes three examples[124] however where, instead, a canal runs round the curve, leaving the central space free for occupation. His first example is the Fountain stibadium at the Villa (Fig.43 and 44). In fact there are two more examples at the Villa – at the Scenic Triclinium (Fig. 81 3-10) and the Water Court (Fig.68 23) – and this frequency at the Villa makes any precedents of great interest. However Letzner's other examples are from Piazza Armerina (outside my period) and a drawing from Codex Destailleur B representing an undatable structure. There is one further possible example.

On the lower level of the Domus Augustana there is a long pool which has at one end a curved covered wall with two storeys of niches (Fig.133 2, Fig.134.2 and 3). This part of the structure has never been properly explained, or explored and recorded. Neuerburg[125] observed accurately that in its final form the lower niches were latrines but that this may not have been the original plan. Since there was also evidence of piping to the niches, Neuerburg concluded that it had originally been a fountain, and was only later converted to a latrine, and was puzzled as to how the latrines could have been used if the basin in front was still full of water.[126] Another fact perhaps indicating a later change of use is that the niches holding the individual seats appear to have been highly visible from the adjoining pool and from above (Fig.134.2). Although Roman multiple latrines were common and the occupants were visible to each other, they were not usually visible from the surrounding rooms or streets outside, but intentionally shielded from view by walls.[127]

---

[123] Thus all of Letzner 1999's Type 6, 7, and most of Type 15.
[124] Letzner 1999 172 Type 15B. Type 15C covers cases where he says there is no evidence one way or the other of a basin (though I believe that in some other cases a detailed examination of the evidence would show that a basin has been assumed rather than actually proven).
[125] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.176. Letzner 1999 does not mention the structure at all. The insertion points for the seats are still visible (Fig.134.2) and the seats themselves were apparently in situ on excavation.
[126] The description in Guattani 1805 post excavation in the 18th century is not very clear and his interpretation of a shallow basin in front is not necessarily reliable. Contra Neudecker 1994 69, this structure has however definitely not been destroyed.
[127] The structure does not fit any of the types of large latrine identified in Neudecker 1994.

It seems to me that there is another way possibly of resolving these inconsistencies for this structure. The floor in front of the niches is in a poor condition and it is by no means apparent now that there was a front wall for a semicircular basin. Perhaps prior to a latrine conversion there was some other means of disposing of the water (like a canal running round the edge), leaving the curved area as a shaded room, backed by a fountain wall. This hypothesis could only be tested by a thorough clearance and detailed examination of the floor area. If correct, this hypothesis would begin to give the kind of clear antecedent for the covered curved fountain walls of the Villa which is currently missing.

Given the earlier appearance and popularity of rectangular fountain rooms, often with curved rear walls, this type of room may be regarded in some senses as a truncated fountain room. The front, rectangular part has been cut off, bringing the occupier closer to the outside world which was visible through the open or colonnaded front edge. In doing this, the designer is in one way going back to the more natural cave-like appearance of a grotto, though I do not think this would be a conscious choice. Another way of looking at it is that the esedra fountain was being adapted for occupation by removal of the central pool.[128]

4.4.5 The Villa

At the Villa, as elsewhere, many flat walls existed which were not decorated, or decorated with pumice, without being further elaborated by fountains or other architectural detail.[129] The fact that there are four flat wall fountains at the Villa indicates a degree of popularity though there is great variation between them in size and design.

The dating of the Cistern Fountain (Cat.1 R2 and 2.4) is problematic and typology does not help – as indicated above, the design is so straightforward, and so obvious a step to take that one cannot rule out the existence of such fountains in private contexts

---

[128] Hornbostel-Hüttner 1979 68 for the idea that the esedra fountain is the apse detached from the apsed fountain room. Neuerburg 1965 28 and 53 sees, rather, the esedra fountain deriving directly from the grotto not via the fountain room form.

[129] Such as the outside of the fountain room in the East Belvedere (Fig.28.2) and the substructures around the Doric Temple terrace, both of which had pumice. We do not know for example how the long niched wall supporting the Fountain Court Terrace, and the similar wall on the west side of the East Peristyle were surface finished, nor if their niches were filled.

at an early date. Apart from the mystery of water disposal here, there is nothing particularly unusual about this three-niche structure in a peripheral area of the Villa.

Although it has been suggested that the Fountain wall adjoining the Small Baths (Figs.64-67) too is an earlier structure, originally belonging to a cistern, for the reasons explained in the catalogue entry I think in fact it is Hadrianic and always had a piped water supply. The fountain part does not occupy the full length of the wall though it is centrally placed on the wall. Its 20m length and the sculpture in the niches and alcoves must surely have been positioned carefully in relation to plantings and any other objects in the garden in front, which has never been explored archaeologically.[130] This wall is a clear example of the occurrence of fountain walls in gardens. Given that the entrance to the luxuriously appointed Small Baths was modest and unassuming, it is tempting to think also that the fountain wall added prestige to the entrance area and hinted at the watery pleasures behind the façade.

The Upper Park Wall (Fig.93) is another fountain positioned on part of a wall, this time the buttress wall separating the Upper Park from more elevated areas further south. The total length of the wall has not been ascertained, but the fountain element is over 50m. The wall is, like the Small Baths wall, adjacent to a modest entrance to an important structure – this time an entrance to the Underground Galleries. It is almost as if the entrances themselves are not being elaborated but rather flagged up in some way. Although the Wall is also near to the Southern Range, Southern Hall etc (the area traditionally termed the Accademia), it is aligned towards the very large unexplored area between here and the upper levels of the Central Service Building some 400m away. Fig.1 shows the relative locations of the Fountain wall and the Central Service Building (34). The lower levels of this building appear to have had an essentially utilitarian role. However the unconnected top level, near to and at the same level as the pool of the Peristyle Pool Building, appears to have had a viewing role out across the (unexplored) garden.[131] The layout of this garden or landscaped area, when it is finally explored, may explain why the wall is asymmetric, with an unequal number of niches either side of the central plain part. Or the answer may lie in a later decision to cut the entrance to the Galleries, thus slicing off a niche.

---

[130] At present the olive trees in the centre of the courtyard and the fact that the modern ground level is significantly higher, makes it difficult to get an impression of the full frontal impact of the wall. It is impossible to photograph face on because of the trees.
[131] Thus Salza Prina Ricotti 1998 388.

The use of steps in the wall is discussed at 6.2.4. Another unusual feature is the combination of chamber above with wall fountain below[132] which is unprecedented in detail but not altogether in principle. Two storey fountain walls were unusual in Italy prior to Hadrian.[133] However there are examples where radically different designs were used, above and below, in a two storey construction, as at the Upper Park Wall. As already discussed the features of the upper part of the fountain wall of the Bagni di Livia are very different to the lower, and the upper part is cut back and sits behind the lower.[134] In the Via degli Annibaldi wall the lower layer of water bearing niches is combined with large non-niche tondos above. At the Upper Park Fountain Wall the chamber adds height and gives a central focus to the wall below and, as restored (Fig.93), has a niched front which echoes the row of smaller niches below.

Finally, the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure (Figs.34-36), an 8m wide, 3 niche structure, which is strictly speaking curved, but hardly so. This fountain protrudes so far from the wall that at first glance it almost appears freestanding. In fact it is another fountain wall, part occupying and utilising a longer wall. This long terracing wall (27 niches) between Fountain Court and the East Terrace rises at this point above the height of the garden at the main entrance of the Island Enclosure. The wall itself did not give enough height for a niched fountain wall, so the wall is built up further, at this point only, to form the upper part of the back of the fountain (Fig.36.1). Thus the terrace wall has been augmented vertically and the position selected for the fountain is clearly related to terminating a view through the main axis of the Island Enclosure, as described in the catalogue entry and visible on Fig.33.

These four fountain walls at the Villa share the common characteristic that they made use of structural or functional features which would be there anyway,[135] but very selectively. Cistern buildings did not usually have decorative façades at the Villa or

---

[132] The fact that the area of wall immediately below the Chamber does not have decorative niches (Fig.93) strongly suggests that the chamber was intended to be the upper focal point of the whole fountain: the plain stretch highlights the chamber above.

[133] Neuerburg 1965 56 says that the wall adjoining the Domus Augustana long pool is, in effect the only material example. Of course upper storeys may have left no traces. Within rooms two storey niche designs are more common.

[134] There is a similar arrangement at Pompeii VIII 2 28. At the garden wall under Via XX Settembre (Letzner 1999 Cat.280 though the evidence for water is not clear) there is a cut back recess set on top of and back from a flat wall.

[135] I believe the Cistern Fountain was first cistern and second fountain – in other words the cistern was in excess of the fountain needs and was there for other more general purposes at this point in the Villa.

elsewhere. Parts only of some retaining walls were selected for embellishment so the Roman taste for richly elaborated and decorated façades[136] was exercised in a controlled fashion in the fountain walls of the Villa.

All the flat fountain walls at the Villa were to be looked at, not to be experienced from within. Covered curved fountain walls without inner pools, on the other hand, gave the opportunity to experience from within, and the resemblance to truncated fountain rooms has already been mentioned. The fact that the Fountain stibadium at the Villa (Cat.1 H8) was unequivocally a dining area, as was the Scenic Triclinium with its stibadium in front of the curved covered fountain wall, suggests a harder look at other covered curved spaces to see if they too might have been used for dining and this is considered in more detail at 7.5.3.

4.4.6 The absence of monumental façade fountains

By this term I mean fountain walls two or even three storeys high, flat or curved, with profuse use of columns and repetitive architectural motifs. When Hadrian was at work on the Villa these fountains were being constructed particularly in Greece, the East and North Africa. Since Hadrian's means and the space available were effectively unlimited, and since discussions of fountains and nymphaea tend to treat these as not essentially different to other fountain types,[137] it is legitimate to ask why there is nothing so large and so elaborate at the Villa. The longest fountain wall at the Villa is on the periphery (the Upper Park Wall); the other examples are, so far as we can tell, single storey[138] and relatively small. They are very modest indeed compared to contemporary provincial structures. The answer seems to be that by this time monumental façade fountains were essentially a feature of public architecture, popular in the provinces, but probably with some connection to earlier public architecture in Italy. The roles they fulfilled did not exist in a dwelling context. They are perhaps the only common form of fountain which did not exist in a dwelling context.

---

[136] Neuerburg 1965 78; Parra 1976 108ff.

[137] Lavagne 1990 for example moves seamlessly from the Bagni di Livia and the wall alongside the Temple of Divus Claudius to the appearance of monumental nymphaea in the east. Neuerburg 1965 76 is similar. Glaser 2000 does separate out public fountain buildings, to include the monumental nymphaea (414ff) from the development of fountain architecture in residential contexts (453ff), though I believe, as outlined above, that there are probably Italian precedents which he does not reference.

[138] See 5.10.4 for the general absence of two storey fountain facades in Italy in private contexts.

Turning back 150 years, Agrippa's overhaul of Rome's water supply incorporated the building of many decorated points of supply, elaborated with bronze and marble statues and columns.[139] It appears that even at that stage, the opportunity was being taken to combine public utility with display and, possibly, personal or dynastic aggrandisement via the choice of statuary. Out in the provinces, improvements to the water supply were strongly associated with urbanisation, prosperity and Romanisation.[140] Water features were prominently located at waystations, on lines of communication, providing (in the guise of a supply point) public locations and many niches for the display of honorific statues, promoting any donor and perhaps emphasising his connection with the imperial family and even deities.[141] None of this was necessary within the confines of a Villa where there were many other ways in which to impress visitors. The water features of the Villa dei Quintili tend to confirm this public/private analysis in Italy itself. Within the villa was a relatively modest fountain with a deep basin,[142] and perhaps two hippodrome gardens (unexplored) which may have incorporated water features. At one end of the villa grounds, on the Via Appia, and with its back to the villa, there was a monumental façade fountain (much changed later on). Several hundred metres from the main villa buildings and turned away from them, it may have signalled the entrance, served as a facility for travellers and acted as a prominent advertisement for the wealthy family but it was turned away from the Villa, and looking towards the main road, and there was nothing like it in the residential core of the Villa.

Conclusions

In discussion of these four types of water feature at the Villa I have come to some different conclusions to those advanced by previous writers both as regards the types in general and the Villa examples in particular. As regards grottoes I find there is no evidence to support the suggestion that a class of artificial grotto triclinia existed in the Roman mind and I find that Hadrian created only one artificial grotto at the Villa, the

---

[139] Pliny *NH* 36.121. Frontinus makes a distinction between points of supply which are munera and those which are lacus – the former, less numerous, seem to be more elaborately decorated (1.2, 2.78, 2.117). They are still too numerous to be the actual aqueduct termini – see Aicher 1993 on (the lack of) this particular tradition of elaboration in ancient Rome.
[140] See Walker 1987 for the process in relation to Greece. Glaser 2000 439-447 for a more general account, separating esedra and facciata types.
[141] MacDonald 1986 99. Aqueduct provision was the most numerous class of public utility sponsored by Hadrian in the provinces (Boatwright 2000 109), though the extent to which he himself took advantage of the opportunity for display is less clear.
[142] Fig.136.3 and 6.3.2.

Park Grotto, which may have been used as an outdoor dining area. Other water feature designs, which may have historically derived from grotto features, had over the ensuing years become completely detached from their origins and no longer carried strong grotto associations. The simultaneous construction of the Park Grotto and the Scenic Triclinium on the same site by the same person exemplifies this dichotomy. As regards fountain rooms I find that they played a relatively unimportant part in the design of the Villa, which is consistent with the evidence from other locations suggesting that, as one of the earliest forms of water feature, they had been overtaken in popularity by other forms. I find that cavea fountains, though not a common form, appear earliest in contexts which suggest they were indeed inspired by the theatre and that at the Villa, one was used as the terminus of a complex which did not resemble a stadium, and the other was used in a stadium shaped complex where it may have recalled stadium rather than theatre seating. In my discussion of fountain walls I have shown that the usual distinction drawn in fountain typologies between flat and curved fountain walls is not as obvious or straightforward as it appears, and found it more fruitful in terms of the role of these fountains to address the question of where they were in relation to other structures, and especially whether the wall was covered and could function as a room, or not. The Villa uses covered curved walls with water niches extensively whereas they can hardly be traced in the archaeological record beforehand and as we will see later there is a persuasive link with a dining role for them. On the other hand the flat fountain walls, uncovered, and the uncovered curved walls, were found in the open air, often making fortuitous use of utilitarian structures which would have existed anyway, making them more attractive and sometimes terminating long views.

5. Pools

Introduction

Pools were used extensively at the Villa either on their own or as part of larger ensembles. As already indicated in 3.2 pools generally, whether set outside in gardens or courtyards or more closely set with buildings or actually covered, have been little considered as a type of water feature. In the absence of a general typology against which to evaluate the Villa pools,[1] I have divided them in a way which makes sense for the Villa and sought to find comparisons and context within the large volume of Italian examples, without here attempting the larger task of to devising a typology into which all the extant examples could be fitted. I have divided the Villa pools into those which stood free of buildings (5.1) and pools with architecture (5.2). In the second category I have focussed on the rectangular pools used on their own. There are curved canals associated with fountain walls or stibadia (for example in front of the Water Court five niche fountain wall, or running around the Scenic Triclinium stibadium) and semicircular pools in these and other locations, but these function as an integral part of a wider water feature. The pools I am concerned with are essentially freestanding.

5.1 Pools outside buildings

5.1.1 Types at the Villa

The Villa has a number of outside pools and with the exception of Cat.1 H2 feature 2 and Cat.1 H15 they are simple and rectangular in plan. Cat.1 H2 feature 2 is very small, shallow, and has mixtilinear internal walls. It acts, in effect as the overflow container for a jet, fountain statue or basin. Cat.1 H15 is discussed at 5.1.9. The other pools fall into two distinct patterns – they are either large and deep (the smallest has a surface area of 300m^2; the minimum depth in any is 1.38m) or long and shallow (a ratio of length to width of 8:1 and upwards and depth of 0.5m or less).

[1] The inadequacy of the typology attempted by Farrar 1996 and 1998 for my purposes is discussed at 3.2.

The large deep pools are

- East West Terrace Pool (Cat.1 H3, Figs 31-32)
- pool in the Peristyle Pool Building (Cat.1 H11, Fig 53)
- Scenic Canal (Cat.1 H17, Fig.83.1)

And the long shallow pools are

- Fountain Court feature 3 (Cat.1 H2 Fig.26)
- pool at the north end of the Stadium Garden (Cat.1 H12, Fig.63)
- pool in the garden of the Water Court (Cat.1 H14, Fig.72).

I will begin by looking at what we know generally about outdoor pools and especially where and why they might be used.

5.1.2 Ancient terminology

The sources are of limited use in revealing the function and reasons for the desirability of these outside pools. The term piscina is used frequently but may be applied to a fishpond, a settling tank, a swimming pool, a tank or vat, or any pool. It can never be taken automatically as implying the presence of fish.[2] A natatio is more clearly a swimming or bathing pool but for problems identifying these in practice see below. A lacus or stagnum is a larger stretch of water which may be natural, or natural in origin. The term euripus (after the narrow strait between Euboea and the Greek mainland) was applied to some known narrow canal-like structures and in particular to a channel in the Campus Martius[3] and to channels within the Circus Maximus (and later ubiquitously to similar channels in other circuses).[4] It was also fashionable, at least in Cicero's day, to call an artificial channel in a private home euripus or - as he

---

[2] Pliny *Ep.*5.6 for example uses the word in two different senses within a few lines. At line 23 he talks of a pool in front of a window where the water foams white as it strikes the marble – suggesting a shallow pool. At line 25 there is a *piscina* which may be used for bathing or perhaps swimming (so deeper and maybe larger). Neither of these pools seems likely to have contained fish – the first probably too shallow, the second used for immersion.

[3] LTUR II 'Euripus.'

[4] At the Circus Maximus originally the channel separating spectators from track and then later the pools in the central barrier (Humphrey 1986 174f and 292-4).

simultaneously makes clear - nilus.[5] We might add to this list of fanciful names for 'channel' canopus (if as many people believe the term applied to Hadrian's Villa is taken to refer to the actual canal leading from Alexandria to Canopus.[6] Pliny the Elder (*NH* 35.37.116) in describing the subjects of Studius' painting notes piscinae, euripos, and amnes separately. Clearly in this context he can distinguish a representation of a piscina (meaning fishpond, or a particular shape of pool?) from a euripus (a recognisably man-made canal?) from an amnis (river). The Campus Martius euripus was definitely used for swimming[7] and perhaps so too was Agrippa's stagnum nearby.[8] However none of the source references of this type can be clearly linked with an archaeologically known structure in a dwelling.

5.1.3 Additional features of pools

Apart from size and shape, some of the outside pools we know from other locations have other distinctive features. First, steps. These can be set into the corner(s) of the pool,[9] or run the whole length of one or more sides.[10] Some other pools with steps are clearly associated with baths or palaestrae.[11] Many large pools do not have, or have not preserved evidence of, steps.[12] Although steps tend to be associated with deeper pools, they also occur in shallow pools where they appear to be decorative rather than useful.[13]

Second, and more unusually, variation in depth (beyond what might be expected to aid drainage/flow). This is clearly marked by further steps within the pool at the Villa dei

---

[5] *De Leg.* II.1.1-3.
[6] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 7 and here 7.5.1. Also, an earlier example, a maiandros (after the river Maeander) in the gardens of the Ptolemaic palace at Alexandria (Nielsen 1994 Cat.20); also La Rocca 1986 10 and 20 for the idea that the shape was formed not by water but by lines of shrubs or hedge.
[7] Seneca *Ep* 83.5.
[8] Coleman 1993 50.
[9] Oplontis (clearly illustrated Jashemski 1979-1993 II Fig 232); Villa dei Centroni (Fig.127); Domus Augustana (Fig.133 2 and Fig.134.2). Steps occur regularly in the large pools which were normally included in the second and first century BC Judaean palaces (Nielsen 1994 Cat.23, 26, 30, 31, supplemented by information from Netzer 1999). Josephus specifically states that the large pools at the palace(s) at Jericho were swimming pools (*Jewish Antiquities* XV.53-56).
[10] For example Minori (Franciosa 1976 Plan 17).
[11] Pompeii palaestra pool (Cozza 1952 268); cruciform pool in Herculaneum palaestra has corner steps (Jashemski 1979-1993 I 162); House of Julia Felix near bath suite (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.144); House of the Silver Wedding near bath suite (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.181).
[12] Nothing recorded for the Villa dei Papiri, San Marco, the Villa of Quintilius Varus, Villa del Pastore, Villa delle Grotte (Elba) and the Villa of Horace at Licenza.
[13] For example the mid second century AD pool at the Casa di Diana, Ostia (Marinucci 2001 234ff).

Centroni (Fig.127). In the Pompeii palaestra pool the depth increases from 0.25 at the stepped end to 2m at the far end.[14]

Third, very unusually, amphorae or similar containers set into the walls below water level with their necks opening into the water,[15] or other niches created below water level.[16]

The significance of these distinctive features for function is discussed below.

5.1.4 Keeping fish and other creatures

Fish were kept in pools for pleasure (ornamental and pets),[17] for the immediate needs of the table,[18] and for breeding and profit.[19] The complex marine pools which were built along the coast and in the sea relied on salt water, or a combination of salt and fresh, and could not be replicated at the Villa. Freshwater fish, though they did not command the high prices of sea fish, were none the less consumable and some sea fish could adapt to a freshwater environment.[20] The clearest archaeological indicator that a freshwater pond was intended to house fish is the insertion of holes in the walls (see amphorae above) with the intention of providing protection from the heat of the sun;[21] possibly also they were locations where eggs could be laid.[22] So far as I am aware, no traces of such recesses in any form have been found in any structure at Hadrian's Villa.[23]

---

[14] Cozza 1952 268.
[15] The long thin pool in the Herculaneum palaestra (Higginbotham 1997 196). Other examples from small Pompeii pools VIII 2 14, VII 2 16 (Higginbotham 1997 198, 201). Examples of the use of amphorae other than in large pools include Sperlonga, in the walls of the island triclinium (Higginbotham 1997 162) and in a large roofed pool at the Villa of Manilius Vopiscus (Higginbotham 1997 125).
[16] Small recesses created with bipedales in the long thin pool at House of Julia Felix, clearly described and illustrated at Higginbotham 1997 207ff.
[17] Pliny *NH* 9.81. Jashemski 1979-1993 I 108 for an overview.
[18] Martial 10.15-23, for example, for the table and pets.
[19] Higginbotham 1997 Ch.3 especially.
[20] Higginbotham 1997 42 on the preference for sea fish; he identifies the eel (44), and the grey mullet (46) as consumable fish which could be kept in freshwater pools. Jashemski 1979-1993 I 108 adds the red mullet.
[21] According to Columella, discussed at Higginbotham 1997 25.
[22] Jashemski 1979-1993 I 110.
[23] Ehrlich 1989 165 asserts that 30% of the still-water features at the Villa were fishponds. In her n.11 she hedges this but still does not say which features are included in her 30% and why. Lafon 1998 n.1 and 574 regrets the failure of Higginbotham 1997 to mention pools at Hadrian's Villa which he says possess characteristic fish hiding-places – he does not specify which pools he means though and at the Villa there appear to be neither the holes nor any other structural shade-providing features. He may be thinking of Aurigemma's Scenic Canal proposal, which is discussed at Cat.1 H17.

Other archaeological indicators of the presence of fish are far less clear-cut. Adequate depth was a requirement – Higginbotham appears to take 1m as a broad rule of thumb[24] but that kind of depth is also consistent with bathing if not swimming. Smaller fish can survive in much shallower water provided they are carefully nurtured. Provision for segregation of different types of fish might be desirable[25] but in the kind of private pools we are concerned with compartmentalisation might be for aesthetic rather than practical reasons.[26] The adequacy of water circulation arrangements can rarely be confirmed from the archaeological remains.[27]

The question of whether shade was always provided for or in fishponds is the most difficult of all both in terms of whether a shade providing mechanism can be identified archaeologically and whether it is invariably necessary and present, so that its presence is a fishpond indicator. As regards mechanisms, shade might be provided by the recesses in pool walls mentioned at 5.1.3, or given at certain times of the day by bridges, by overhanging planting, or nearby pergolas, and by pool walls which were contoured rather than straight in plan.[28] Not all of these features leave traces in the archaeological record and most of them might be present for other reasons. In particular, contoured internal walls cannot be taken automatically as indicating fishpond use.[29] At the House of Julia Felix, for example, recesses formed by bipedales were constructed in addition to the niched sides and bridges (Fig.126.2). Was one form of shade provision not enough? Or were the niched sides and the bridges for decoration and crossing points rather than fish shade? Whatever the merit of this argument, however, there are no potential fish pools with internally niched sides at Hadrian's Villa.[30]

---

[24] Higginbotham 1997; for example 22.
[25] Pets from food, predators from prey etc (Higginbotham 1997 23).
[26] The design of the lower channel at the House of Loreius Tiburtinus (Pompeii II 2 2) may be explained both in terms of fish keeping (Higginbotham 1997 211f) and decorative variation (Zanker 1998 154-156).
[27] Higginbotham 1997 13f.
[28] Higginbotham 1997 25ff.
[29] The contoured sides appear to be the main basis for Higginbotham suggesting (inter alia) that the pool at the House of Diomede and an upper pool in the Domus Augustana were fishponds (Higginbotham 1997 120 and 205).
[30] The only pool with internally niched sides is Fountain Court 2, very small (2.8m externally) and more important very shallow.

It appears in any event that specific shade provision is not an absolute necessity. The only fish remains recovered from a pool in Pompeii were in a rectangular pool with a simple semi-circular addition – no evidence of hiding-holes or a more complex shade-providing shape or external shade is recorded.[31] At the Scenic Canal today a combination of murky water and depth provide a habitat in which a variety and large numbers of fish survive without special shade provision.

The presence today of swans and ducks on the East West Terrace and Scenic Canal and turtles in the Island Enclosure canal is a reminder that other creatures might well choose to inhabit (or be deliberately introduced into) these large stretches of water.[32]

5.1.5 Swimming

Steps were regularly provided in baths for access to the pools, and the presence of steps in a large deep pool not connected with a bath suite is an indicator, but not a guarantee, that one of the pool functions was 'stand alone' swimming or bathing.[33] The pool at the Villa dei Centroni (Fig.127) has a combination of features – size, steps, and gradation of depth – which lend it the appearance of a modern swimming bath. The combination at the Domus Augustana of steps in the corner of the pool (together with an access point from the side corridor there) and what appears to be a sitting ledge all around the pool (too narrow for a walkway) also suggests that here there was a freestanding but enclosed bathing pool (Fig.134.2 and 3).[34]

However the absence of steps at any location does not prove that the pool was not used for bathing since it is always possible for a reasonably fit person get into, and lift themselves out of, a pool at any point along the sides. Nor is the absence of gradation

---

[31] House of the Centenary (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.506).
[32] There are ducks in a painting of a square pool in a formal garden from the Auditorium of Maecenas, illustrated De Vos 1983 242. For a turtle shell at Pompeii see Jashemski 1979-1993 I 103f.
[33] See n.13 above for steps in a pool too shallow for bathing. There are also steps into the long thin pool at the House of Julia Felix (Fig. 126.2 E, in bottom left hand corner). Here the niched sides and low bridges make swimming unlikely, and the bipedale recesses suggest fish. The Roman attitude to swimming is outlined at Harris 1972 116ff (noting, contra 118, that piscina does not necessarily mean swimming pool). Yegül 1992 37 notes that even the largest pools in the imperial baths were often relatively shallow and intended not so much for swimming as wading and bathing.
[34] A recently discovered pool at Massalubrense near Sorrento, with an elaborate niched mosaic wall, maybe 20m long, has also been identified as a natatio. Frustratingly, there is no clear published information about depth or width and no mention of any signs of internal features, so whether it was a swimming pool has not been satisfactorily demonstrated (Borriello 1996 142-146; Sampaolo 1995 passim).

conclusive, provided there is enough depth throughout for immersion. It is less likely that pools with heavily niched sides were intended for regular bathing since the edges of the niches are a hazard possibly leading to scrapes and bruises.

The question of whether swimming might be combined with (perhaps only ornamental) fish keeping is not resolved by the sources and the two functions are not structurally exclusive. Very occasionally hiding holes are found as well as steps.[35] Much would depend on taste and preference and little is known for example about the extent to which (especially) white marble lined pools were kept clear and clean and thus perhaps a less natural habitat for fish but a more attractive bathing prospect.[36]

5.1.6 Water entertainment

No pool at the Villa is large enough or deep enough[37] to permit the staging of the full-scale naumachia which were provided for public entertainment.[38] However the Scenic Canal and the East West Terrace pool were of comparable size to basins in the amphitheatres at Mérida and Verona (and the Mérida basin was only 1.25m deep), both of which were evidently flooded for displays of some sort.[39] Possible entertainments in these smaller pools might include miniaturised battles or perhaps a kind of water ballet similar to that performed by 'Nereids' at the Colosseum in 80AD.[40]

5.1.7 Dining and boating

We specifically hear and know of floating pleasure ships from the Hellenistic, late Republican and Julio-Claudian periods.[41] All the known examples relate to larger craft

---

[35] For example this appear to be the case with the circular pool at the so-called Terme della Sosandra at Baiae (Higginbotham 1997 187).
[36] Nielsen 1994 170 proposes that pools may have combined culinary and swimming functions.
[37] Though MacDonald and Pinto 1995 has an interesting proposal about the Bog (see Cat.1 exclusion 1).
[38] Coleman 1993 passim.
[39] Coleman 1993 57. The question of water displays at the Colosseum is discussed at 58. Recent work at Posillipo has brought to light again a pool measuring 26.35 x 3.8m, at right angles to the cavea, which it is suggested was filled for aquatic displays, and covered otherwise (De Caro 2002 47).
[40] Coleman 1993 63f.
[41] Athenaeus 206d and ff on the ships built by Hieron 1 of Syracuse and Ptolemy IV Philopator; Suetonius *Julius Caesar* 52, for example, on Cleopatra's famous barge. For the ships recovered from the lake at Nemi see Palazzo Massimo 1998 157ff. Tacitus *Ann.* XV.37.2-7 describes an infamous floating banquet which evidently took place on the stagnum in the Campus Martius in the time of Nero.

and larger pieces of water than exist at the Villa but small boats or temporary rafts could well have been used there.

5.1.8 Large deep pools at the Villa

It is evident from the discussion above that the archaeological evidence for the function of large deep pools is often so ambivalent that one author's fishpond is another's natatio.[42] The large deep pools at the Villa are the East West Terrace pool, the pool in the Peristyle Pool Building and the Scenic Canal, measuring roughly 106 x 26m, 28 x 10.5m and 121 x 19m respectively. All of these completely lack any evidence of amphorae, steps or other clearly distinguishing features though there is some variation in depth for the first and last.[43] Nonetheless it is possible to draw some tentative conclusions about their roles in the Villa, looking at them in context, and starting with the East West Terrace and its pool.

The pool has been described as a fishpond, [44] a swimming pool,[45] and a *naumachia*[46] and there are a number of more detailed theories about the broader role and design of the Terrace and its pool Coarelli has attempted to portray the ambulatory wall on the Terrace together with the pool and the Villa baths as a parallel for, or reference to, a particular group of buildings in Rome - the Hecatostylon, the stagnum and the Baths of Agrippa on the Campus Martius.[47] The stagnum of Agrippa was many times the size[48] of the East West Terrace pool and probably almost square. Whether Coarelli is right to feel there would be any sense of connection between the Rome structures themselves, spread due to their scale over a large area, is debatable. At the Villa on the other hand there is a clear sense of design connection between the ambulatory wall and the parallel pool (Fig.31) but no connection and some distance between the terrace and any

---

[42]For example San Marco: Jashemski 1979-1993 I 330 'swimming pool'; Higginbotham 1997 Ch. 2 n.45 possible fishpond. Villa of Quintilius Varus: Cozza 1952 270 *natatio*; Mielsch 1999 41 the ambiguous *piscina*; Higginbotham 1997 122, firmly, fishpond, the provision of shade by means of recesses under the platforms protruding into the pool at either end. Yet these could also be platforms for the display of statuary, or dining platforms.

[43] It is actually the roofed pool under the Doric Temple, with its steps in two corners, which most clearly suggests a swimming function separate from any baths (see 4.2.4).

[44] For example Aurigemma 1961 22, De Franceschini 1991 730.

[45] For example Cozza 1952 268.

[46] For example Gusman 1904 133, Penna 1831-36 II No. 64.

[47] Coarelli 1997.

[48] Estimated at 180m x 220-300m (Coleman 1993 50).

of the Villa bath suites. At Fig.1 the pool is at 14 and the nearest baths are quite separate at 20. The terrace is turned in on itself and centred on the pool.

Humphrey suggests[49] that the pool recalls a circus euripus, but it does not have any of the structural features of the circus barriers and the proportions are wrong. Stierlin's proposal that the Terrace actually functioned as a circus or hippodrome is advanced at length[50] in the course of his general interpretation of the Villa as a cult centre. This proposal takes insufficient account of the practicalities of operating a circus or hippodrome in this location – such as getting animals and chariots onto the terrace, providing stabling, erecting starting gates and seating. Teja 1990's suggestion that the area was a real exercise ground with a swimming pool for a garrison, who accessed it via a road from their quarters in the Northern Ruins, seems to me wholly at odds with the atmosphere of a Roman villa. In addition there are no rooms around the open area for the usual facilities of a palaestra, nor was it adjacent to the baths. There is in any event a palaestra-like structure in the Northern Ruins themselves.

Salza Prina Ricotti has suggested that the Terrace functioned as an overflow area for large banquets taking place in the Stadium Garden/Arcaded Triclinium complex.[51] This would be feasible with temporary awnings, or shade provided by pergolas (no signs of any more substantial constructions in the open area around the pool have ever been recorded). Whether Hadrian ever entertained on this scale at the Villa is not specified by the sources.[52] The pool might have provided a setting for some sort of aquatic display though the actual entertainments he is said to have provided for his dinner guests are either for more intimate gatherings (instrumental recitals, readings) or best suited to a theatre (tragedies, comedies, farces). The North Theatre (Fig.1 2) in fact had a large colonnaded enclosure attached, not explored in modern times, which might have served for the large-scale banqueting of visitors invited to the theatre.

In fact a large deep pool such as the East West Terrace Pool, surrounded by a large space revealing no signs of architectural content, and then by colonnades, is entirely consistent with similar designs at other large villas with large pools in peristyle

---

[49] Humphrey 1986 686 n.113a.
[50] Stierlin 1984 153.
[51] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 179.
[52] Salza Prina Ricotti's theories about the nature of large scale entertaining at the Villa are discussed at Chapter 7 (Arcaded Triclinium, Stadium Garden, Water Court, Scenic Triclinium and Canal) and 10.1. The entertainment Hadrian provided for his guests is listed at *SHA* Hadr.16.3f.

gardens.[53] It can be explained by its own decorative charm, and evident previous popularity, if the design is fleshed out with the kind of plantings and statuary we happen to know of from other villas such as the villa at Oplontis or the Villa dei Papiri. Several of these pools are similarly devoid of any signs of fish rearing or swimming adaptations. That is not to say that fish, or birds, were not encouraged for decoration of the pool, nor that gentle boating or even floating, dining or swimming might not take place, but rather that a peaceful green space with a sheltered walk, here in the form of the ambulatory wall, with the glitter of a large expanse of water had its own recreational value in the larger establishments. At the Villa the pool could be enjoyed (and still can) not just from ground level but also from the upper levels of a number of the surrounding buildings, especially the Peristyle Pool Building (Fig.32.1).

Some modern authors assume the large pool in the Peristyle Pool Building itself (Fig.53.1) was a fishpond[54] but it is again devoid of any special features associated with fish, or indeed swimming. Getting into the pool for swimming would involve descending to pavement level from the upper colonnaded walkway and then climbing somehow up the side of the pool and then dropping into it, since there were, it appears, no steps inside or out. The design then makes it difficult, not easy, to swim in the pool. It is too small for any aquatic display or for boating.

The pool has two unusual features which are not, to my knowledge, replicated in any other pool of a similar size. First it is a tank raised above the ground rather than sunk into it. There are examples of small raised tanks – for example in the Domus Fulminata, Ostia, [55] and many in the gardens of Pompeii described by Jashemski 1979-1993. The largest example I have identified at Ostia (or anywhere else) does not appear to be in a dwelling and is still much smaller (one quarter the surface area) and shallower (less than half the depth) than the pool in the Peristyle Pool Building.[56] There does not appear to be any reason why the Peristyle Pool at the Villa could not have been sunk into the artificial terrace below it (Fig.51 and 52) so the decision to

---

[53] Apart from the large pools already mentioned, the pool in the villa of Domitian at Circeo (59 x 32m) is another interesting comparison. There is no recorded evidence of steps or pedestals, nor is depth noted. It has one rounded end. The pool is not apparently Domitianic though but belongs to the Republican phase of the villa (Lugli 1928 71 No. 13).

[54] For example Aurigemma 1961 160; De Franceschini 1991 234 PE37. The on-site literature (Museo Didattico) suggests it was unlikely that there would have been a fishpond for food in the middle of the imperial palace, and that it was a decorative, reflective pond only.

[55] Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 II Cat.100.

[56] Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 II Fontane Cat.139 (Cortile del Dionisio), Hadrianic.

raise the water level to, roughly, the level of the upper colonnaded walkway, thus closer to the walkers up there, seems to be for decorative and impressive effect (given its size) rather than practical reasons.

The second feature not identifiable anywhere else is that it has externally (not internally) niched sides. As for the niched walls, the Catalogue entry suggests how a niched wall, with a buttressing effect, might be an aesthetically preferable option to a straight thick wall for containing the outward thrust of some 440 cubic metres of water within. The arrangement might be viewed as the application of niched terrace buttressing but to water rather than (as usual) a landmass. Here the niches are truncated in height according to the pool depth.

The niches line up with the cryptoporticus windows and with the intercolumniations of the upper walkway but whatever was placed in the niches – if anything – would have been seen best from alongside, by a person walking the mosaic pavement surrounding the pool, though whether there was permanent access to this pavement is an unresolved question (see Catalogue entry). Contoured walls *within* pools occur regularly not just in the small gardens at Pompeii but more dramatically and very frequently within the Domus Flavia and Augustana on the Palatine.[57] The pool at the Schola del Traiano in Ostia[58] is another large example this time of mid second century AD date, and not in a dwelling. Contoured internal walls do not occur at all at the Villa.[59] Conversely the external niched wall for a pool found here at the Villa does not occur elsewhere else that I have been able to identify, on any scale. Essentially the 'usual' arrangement has been turned inside out so the pool interacts with the space around it rather having a straight external border.

The niches seem unlikely to have contained statuary. Figure statues of a height appropriate to the width of the niches would have projected above the height of the niches in a way which cannot be identified elsewhere in Roman design.[60] This difficulty with fitting full size statues in the niches has led MacDonald and Pinto 1995

---

[57] The niched inner walls of the pool at the House of Apollo (VI 7 23, most accessibly illustrated at Zanker 1998 Fig 82 and 82) are a complex combination of statuary bases and curved and straight sections (which were stepped as well). For the Palatine see Fig. 132 nos. 10, 19, 12 and 14 (niching not actually shown on 19 and 14); Fig. 133 11 and 13).

[58] Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 II Fontane Cat.142.

[59] With the very minor exception of Fountain Court feature 2.

[60] See Cat.1 H11 for the reasons why the dimensions of the niches seem likely to approximate to their original appearance.

to a suggestion that they were fishing platforms.[61] However there are far more fishing positions than the size of the pond merits and the alternating niches are more elaborate than such a practical purpose requires. There is no evidence either of planting cavities within the niches.[62] One possibility for contents is a series of marble vases, much the same height as the niches. The view of these would mainly have been enjoyed by walkers on the mosaic pavement. On the other hand the niches may just have been faced with marble and left as simply decorated undulating surfaces. Gusman[63] suggests another decorative possibility – that statues or vases stood between the niches, effectively on the pool edge, at its thickest points, and thus more or less level with people walking round the quadroporticus.

Finally the Scenic Canal is a large deep pool which could have been used for swimming, for boating, and for fish. The pedestals could even have functioned as turning posts, in the position of metae, in races in the pool for swimmers or small craft. The separation of the rectangular pool at the south end from the main pool (Fig.81 31), which is not structurally necessary and has no great aesthetic consequence, might have marked out a separate purpose for this part of the water – perhaps the keeping of fish (in a smaller area where they would have been more visible and accessible) – or perhaps the segregation of special or favourite fish.

There are two major differences between the Canal and the two other large deep pools at the Villa. First the Canal is integrated with a major building – the Triclinium – so though enormous in its own right it also functions as the view from the Triclinium and the approach to the Triclinium (Fig.83, 85.2-3). At the south end the water surface leads right into the building, under the semi-dome, via the transitional rectangular and semicircular linking pools (Figs.80-81).[64] Neither the pool on the East West Terrace nor the Peristyle Pool Building pool is connected with the buildings around in the same way. They stand alone as the focus of an open space. The relationship of Scenic

---

[61] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 75.
[62] Such as are found, for example, in the niched wall running parallel to the long thin pool at the House of Julia Felix in Pompeii (Fig 126.2 to the right of E).
[63] Gusman 1904 190.
[64] The long pool/building combination might be repeated at the Park Grotto if Salza Prina Ricotti's hypothesis is correct (Cat.1 H20).

Triclinium and Canal has no true precedent in the other large villa pools I have identified and examined.[65]

Second, we know that sculpture and architectural sculpture were closely integrated with this pool. The occurrence of pedestals within a large pool seems to be unusual[66] (although of course early excavation records for many sites are not necessarily reliable) and the pedestals in the Canal can only really be compared with grotto examples – but the Canal is not in any sense grotto-like.[67] The statuary, columns and architrave placed on the very edge of the pool on the other hand are a highly elaborate and monumental rendering of a more familiar pattern of decoration which could be seen 100 years earlier around the small garden pools of Pompeii[68] and on a larger scale at Oplontis and the Villa dei Papiri (Fig.124.2). At Oplontis and Villa dei Papiri however, the majority of the statues were sited in the surrounding gardens, with just one or two pieces, so far as we can tell, placed on the edge of the pool, and there is no stone architectural framework immediately around the pool edge. At the Villa the East West Terrace pool has not preserved any evidence of column or statue bases in its vicinity at all;[69] whether statues at pool level surrounded the Peristyle Pool is, as we have seen, an open question. So the integration with an important building and the use of a sculptural programme of predominantly formal subjects with pronounced elements of symmetry (discussed at 9.4), very close to and indeed within the pool, indicates that at the Canal the large pool itself is subsidiary, though integral to, a larger picture and

---

[65] Plans of San Marco can appear to suggest that the large pool connects with a niched wall with a rear extension via a semicircular pool (Fig. 130.1) in a design not dissimilar to that of the Scenic Canal and Triclinium. However the wall had no covering, there was no evidence of pipework in the wall, and whetehr there was any in the rear extension is not clear (speculation at Barbet and Miniero 1999 49, 85, 102). The fountain building at the upper level of the Domus Augustana north of the Hippodrome may be similar in design to the Scenic Triclinium (Lugli 1946 514 and Neuerburg 1965 Cat.179) but there is no evidence of a pool in front.

[66] At San Marco an alabaster crater fountain was found in situ on a marble-faced pedestal at the extreme south end of the large pool. The dimensions of the crater (Fig.122.2) - height 0.63m, diameter at top 0.33m -are very modest compared to the overall dimensions of the pool - 0 x 6m. See also 9.1.1 for large empty pools.

[67] For discussion see 4.1.5, 7.5 and 9.4.

[68] For example, along both sides of the upper canal at the House of Loreius Tiburtinus II 2 2.

[69] The East West Terrace pool was never infilled to the extent that the Canal was, but it was filled to some extent, offering the chance that sculpture would have been buried in it. It is not clear whether it was ever cleared to floor level before the 1950s but at that stage one would have expected any significant finds to have been reported. The total absence of any reported finds whatsoever from within the pool, which like the Canal was thoroughly stripped of its facing, strongly suggests that (unlike the Canal) in fact there was nothing around it which could conveniently fall or be pushed into it.

purpose, whereas the other large deep pools at the Villa may well have existed more simply for their own highly decorative merits.[70]

In general the depth of the large deep pools produced a visual effect different to that of a shallow pool. We do not know how clear the water used would have been but at depths of 1.5-2m the water in these pools will certainly have had a different, darker colour as compared to shallow pools. The volume of water in the pool as compared to the volume of water entering and leaving probably means that they gave little indication that the water was moving, and no sound effects, such as might be achieved with a shallower covering of water. At locations with long shallow pools, different effects were achieved, as we shall see below.

5.1.9 Long shallow pools at the Villa

There are three rectangular outside pools at the Villa (Fountain Court feature 3, the pool at the north end of the Stadium Garden, and the pool in the peristyle garden of the Water Court) which do not have the depth characteristic of the pools described above (minimum depth 1.38m), being 0.5m deep or less.[71] I have considered whether these pools – although they now appear shallow – might originally have been significantly deeper. In each case the floor level of the pool appears to have been clearly established by the excavators. The only way they could have been deeper is by having sides which were raised above ground level which have not survived – so that they were tanks in the fashion of the Peristyle Pool Building Pool and in the fashion of many small examples found in the gardens of Pompeii and at Ostia. However whereas the Peristyle Pool Building Pool was principally viewed from the quadroporticus at a

---

[70] Manderscheid 2000a n.103 cites as a comparison for the Scenic Canal a pool (partly) uncovered in 1980 in Rome (Via Cesare Baronio). It has been incompletely published but appears to differ in several respects and in particular has different proportions and a large round central feature with caissons or mixtilinear features reminiscent of the Flavian Palatine pools. The date is unclear but could be as early as late 1st century AD.

[71] I have considered whether these pools – although they now appear shallow – might originally have been significantly deeper. In each case the floor level of the pool appears to have been clearly established by the excavators so the only way they could have been deeper is by having sides which were raised above ground level which have not survived – that they were tanks in the fashion of the Peristyle Pool Building Pool. The Peristyle Pool Building Pool was principally viewed from the quadroporticus at a higher level, but these pools were parts of gardens and outdoor views enjoyed by people standing or sitting or reclining at the same ground level. Raised tanks in these circumstances would interrupt and restrict rather than enhance the view. The axial view along the length of the pool appears to be an important element of design at the Stadium Garden and the Water Court (for discussion see 5.11) it seems particularly unlikely that this would have been obstructed by walls raised high. The contextual evidence suggests that the pools which now appear shallow were in fact originally shallow (less than 0.5m) and deliberately so.

higher level, the three pools here were parts of substantial gardens and outdoor views enjoyed by people standing or sitting or reclining at the same ground level (Figs. 22, 55 10, and 68 7). Deep tanks in these circumstances would interrupt and restrict rather than enhance the view and there are no identifiable examples of large deep tanks in these kinds of settings - at the Schola del Traiano in Ostia, for example,[72] the sides of the large long thin pool are raised but preserved to a height of well under 0.5m. The contextual evidence suggests that the pools at the Villa which now appear shallow were in fact originally shallow (less than 0.5m) and deliberately so. In contrast to the calm depths of the large deep pools, the long shallow pools use the water, I suggest, to create movement and, in two cases (maybe three) splashing.

At Fountain Court feature 3 we have a very long shallow pool (Fig.26), evidently in a garden occupying the Fountain Court terrace, linking two octagonal basins which have their closest parallel in the planter pool at the Oplontis villa (Fig.125 16). Fountain Court feature 3 is in a space of irregular shape (Fig.22). The Republican fountain room (Cat.1 R3) and Residence Quadrangle to the south were oriented one way and it was evidently a deliberate decision to orient Fountain Court East and West another, strictly north. This orientation was again different to that of the Fountain Court terrace wall. Thus the area of the terrace between the terrace wall and the Fountain Court buildings was asymmetrical in plan. The location of feature 3 is such that the terminal octagonal basins align generally with views from the new buildings (Fig.25), while the channel itself is parallel to the misaligned terrace wall. Thus the whole feature partakes of two different orientations, and joins them. The joining of the fountains by the channel also visually links the main rooms of the two Fountain Court buildings in a more direct way than the covered irregular corridor, which ran between them. The possible resemblance of this long thin garden with its long thin pool along the main axis to a stadium (or hippodrome, or circus) garden is noted at 7.3.1.

It has been suggested[73] that the terminal features are aligned so that a person reclining on a bench, or in place of honour while dining, in either Fountain Court East or West had one or the other in focus (and conversely the view from other angles would not be quite as well framed). The use of Fountain Courts East and West as dining rooms is

---

[72] Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 II Fontane Cat.142.
[73] Bek 1980 199. MacDonald and Pinto 1995 175, and footnote, do not appear to be totally convinced either.

not universally agreed and not unequivocally suggested by architecture and floor design but the precise location of the terminal fountains would certainly provide a view for a group of onlookers in each room. In any event, the very unusual design of the whole feature (I cannot find any parallel for a channel with elaborate matching terminal features rather than say simple rounded ends) is made to measure for its location.

As explained in the Catalogue entry we do not know what exactly occupied the very centre of the octagonal termini, but very probably it involved either a simple jet or a sculpture with jet. The water ran down the channel from east to west. The shallowness of the channel means that it was probably visibly moving over the white marble lining. Perhaps this movement too, coupled with the splashing jets at either end, was intended to distract the eye of the viewer leaving Fountain Court East or West, or approaching via the steps from other terraces, from the awkward shape of the surrounding area.

In the Stadium Garden the north pool is also shallow (0.2m[74]) and the flow of water south-north would be towards the occupants of a probable dining room (Fig.55 2), which is precisely lined up with the canal and planting beds.[75] Here the water movement was perhaps not so much generated by the canal as by the jets splashing into it from the long sides.[76] Colour contrast was also clearly important with red earth borders, planting beds presumably filled with green plants and the white marble canal and splashing water. No statuary is known from this area of the garden, which formed the first element of the long axial view all the way through to the basin fountain at the far end (Fig.56.2). The canal and lateral jets lead the eye into the distance in the same way as the Scenic Canal directs attention toward the Triclinium, but at the Stadium Garden, unlike the Scenic Canal, the viewer was never intended to approach the sides of the pool closely. The rock cut planting beds each side with their raised edges formed a barrier and indeed from the side colonnades of the north sector of the Stadium Garden the pool itself (though maybe not the jets) may have been invisible

---

[74] Hoffmann 1980 19: 2/3 Roman foot.
[75] The width between the portico columns is also increased in front of this room to leave the full width of the canal visible.
[76] Such side jets are well known, if not common, at Pompeii for example: IX 14 4, House of the Count of Turin, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.518; VI Ins. Occ. 42, House of the Golden Bracelet, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.313; III 2 1, House of A Trebius Valens, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.156.

because of the plantings. This pool was not for walking round; it was principally for looking along.

At the Water Court the long shallow pool, also lined with white marble, was again very much for looking along and in this case again the most impressive view today is from the main building out towards the vestibule (Fig.72.2) with its great dome. However the vast majority of the rooms within the main block do not look out to the garden but inwards towards the central rooms. This view down the canal from within the building can only be had from the most central strip of the main room. The view up the canal, on entering the Water Court from its vestibule (Fig.72.1), was towards the main entrance of the main block. The Scenic Canal leads the eye to the Triclinium in a similar way but here at the Water Court the water was framed by plantings not columns and statuary – lower lying plants immediately by the pool and probably trees further away to the sides.[77]

The length of the pool is broken into three segments and the 'V' shaped division at the main building end is particularly striking (see again Fig.72.2), counter-pointing the silhouette of the vestibule at the other end. The purpose of the deep channel along the main axis is not understood but there may have been a pipe with jets (see Cat.1 H14). As with the Stadium Garden, it is doubtful whether the viewer was meant to approach or walk alongside the pool among the plantings, but rather was intended to enjoy the full view of the pool from either end, as it lay placed at the base of the 'V' silhouette formed by plantings increasing in height away from the pool, or catch glimpses of the water between plantings as they walked the colonnades of the courtyard. However the whole garden seems to have been laid out first and foremost with the view from the main room of the main block in mind.

The apparent importance of moving water in these pools, as compared to the large deep pools, brings us back to the vexed term euripus and to Seneca's indication that in some of these euripi at least, dramatic effects were achieved by filling and emptying with a sudden rush of water (which may well have been deliberately reminiscent of the strong current of the original Euripus or the rising of the Nile, flooding its banks).[78]

---

[77] Suggested by the excavators on the basis of the relative size and depth of the planting pits cut into the rock (Jashemski 1992 594f).

[78] Seneca *Ep.* 90.1.5. The examples he is giving here of excessive and foolish 'gadgets' do not appear to be hyperbole but technical feats well within the grasp of Roman engineering. The notion that the canals

Sudden filling and emptying can only be achieved in relatively shallow or small pools unless there is a great quantity of water arriving at high pressure.[79] If this effect was achieved anywhere at the Villa, it must have been in the shallower pools but there is no clear evidence that this was hydraulically possible at either of these three locations and some contra indications. Fountain Court feature 3 is not associated with any building from which to view the rush, end on, and the Stadium Garden pool seems to have been filled normally by side jets – not quite the 'rush of water' described.

There is one further large shallow exterior pool[80] at the Villa which is a quite different shape to other pools at the Villa and indeed to any known previous model, and that is the pool in the water feature adjoining the Water Court (Cat.1 H15, Fig.75). In effect it has only two sinuously curved sides. Round pools are uncommon generally,[81] semicircular pools and rectangular pools with curved additions are more common but this use of sinuous curves (or even a sinuous curve) is unique to the best of my knowledge.[82] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 speculate on the origins of the 'reverse curve' structures including this one at the Villa and their original and experimental nature.[83] In this particular case, reverse curves have been chosen for the open façade of the building and the shape of the pool. I believe there were steps leading into the pool all along the walkway edge (Fig.77.3) – in this respect they are similar to the steps extending the full length of a side which are commonly found in bath pools. Although one cannot rule out bathing here (but probably it was too shallow for actual swimming) I believe the steps also serve the purpose of softening the visible edge between walkway and pool for the viewer looking out from the domed building or walkway. Hard lines and strict angles are a normal feature of Roman pools but here a very conscious attempt is made to avoid them.

---

at the House of M Loreius Tiburtinus (II 2 2) were flooded in imitation of the Nile is far from universally agreed (for references Clarke 194).

[79] Unlikely at these points in the Villa, far from the point of entry of the aqueducts, after supplies have already been drawn off for many other purposes, and even with the help of water backed up in cisterns.

[80] The exact depth cannot be established without proper clearance of the site but it appears to be significantly less than 1m.

[81] A couple of examples from Pompeii are I 2 6 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.2) and VII 4 48 (House of the Hunt, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.352).

[82] The pool at Zaghouan, also Hadrianic, also has a unique 'double horseshoe' shape, surrounded by steps. The surrounding architecture and context is quite different but it perhaps confirms a taste for occasional experimentation with forms other than the standard and enduringly popular pool shapes (Rakob 1969).

[83] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 99ff.

5.2 Pools with architecture

5.2.1 Types at the Villa

This section deals with the occurrence at the Villa of pools which are

- indoors (though there usually are roof openings above them)
- usually relatively small (especially as compared to the pools discussed at 5.1)
- shallow, polygonal and set in the floor.
- not integrally part of a larger water feature.

The pools under consideration are

- three floor pools in the Water Court main building (Cat.1 H14, Fig.70)
- two in the Water Court Vestibule (Fig.71)
- pool in the Stadium Garden north hall (Cat.1 H12, Fig.55 12)
- Fountain Court feature 4 (Cat.1 H2, Fig 27)
- two pools in the east and west part of the Arcaded Triclinium (Cat.1 H10, Fig.47) - though these are technically outdoors they are close set with architecture.

I begin by looking at these pools to see if they are connected to dining arrangements as first century pools sometimes were.

5.2.2 Dining pools

Triclinia[84] arranged round pools were found outdoors as well as indoors;[85] there were also biclinium arrangements with the pool in the middle. The design might include a table top fountain where water rose from a jet and fell onto a flat marble table, usually round, and then trickled over the edge – they are found at Pompeii both as decoration

[84] By this I mean a rectangular three couch dining arrangement, the pool in the open space at the centre, to be distinguished from dining set-ups involving the use of a curved couch (stibadium). This distinction follows Dunbabin 1996 72 n.30.

[85] There is extensive literature on occurrence and practice which Dunbabin 1991 and Dunbabin 1996 summarise and enlarge.

for pools,[86] and as a centrepiece for dining couches (the jet would presumably be turned off when the meal was in progress).[87]

The hardest evidence for the occurrence of dining around pools comes from masonry triclinia and floor design though on many occasions couches will have been set up temporarily and left no conclusive trace in the archaeological record.[88] Most of the evidence comes from Pompeii and not from villas, but for example the outdoor setting buried under the Domus Flavia (so called Bagni di Livia, Fig.135.1),[89] and the indoor arrangement at Punta Epitaffio (Fig.128),[90] demonstrate that these dining arrangements existed in Rome and in villas.

However, there is no hard evidence of rectangular dining arrangements centred on a pool at the Villa and all the floor pools I have identified at the Villa are unsuitable for these small-scale arrangements for one reason or another. It would be possible to arrange couches around the pool at the centre of the Water Court main building but the set-up would be out of all proportion to the scale of the room. The twin side pools here are the focus of the adjacent rooms and setting up couches immediately around them would obscure the view. The pools in the Water Court Vestibule are too small and attached to the walls. The pool in the Stadium Garden north hall is too large for a normal couch arrangement. The space around Fountain Court feature 4 is limited and the pool not a suitable shape. Triclinium shapes would fit oddly into the semicircular spaces surrounding the two pools in the east and west part of the Arcaded Triclinium. On the other hand there are two masonry stibadia at the Villa (Scenic Triclinium and Fountain stibadium) and both of these use pools in the form of semicircular canals following the curving couch. At 10.1.2 I draw together the evidence for water dining at the Villa suggesting that stibadium dining, with water associated, was more established by the early second century than is often thought. These arrangements in effect replaced the water triclinium arrangements which had been used in the first century.

---

[86] For example House of the Meleager (VI 9 2); House of Holconius Rufus (VIII 4 4); House of Camillus (VII 12 23).
[87] For example House of the Silver Wedding (V 2 1); House of Trebius Valens (III 2 1); House of Acceptus and Euhodia (VIII 5 39). Further examples at Andersson 1990 n.98.
[88] Andersson suggests such an arrangement for example for the pool in front of the fountain wall at Casa del Torello (Andersson 1990 228).
[89] LTUR II 199ff
[90] Letzner 1999 Cat.164.

5.2.3 The influence of the impluvium

If the indoor pools at the Villa were not linked to dining, what were their origins and roles and in particular is there a link with impluvium pools in atria?[91]

It has rightly been pointed out that atrium houses constituted a majority at Pompeii within the town right up to 79AD and that the largest and most important dwellings were (still) atrium houses.[92] In practice people then as now continued to use houses built many years before, so that at any given point in time 'old fashioned' design would be adjacent to new ideas, just as the four styles of wall painting might be found in the same dwelling.[93] Nonetheless where building from scratch or carrying out major reconstruction, imperial builders from Nero onwards built different structures for the functions, especially receiving functions, formerly focussed on the atrium and there is evidence that they did away with atria where they previously existed.[94] It has been argued that Rooms 44/45 in the Esquiline Wing of the Domus Aurea had been an atrium/triclinium arrangement in their first manifestation, but were radically altered in their final appearance.[95] There is nothing atrium-like on the Palatine. Hadrian extensively altered the layout of Republican villa 1 in the new Villa[96] and thereby lost the atrium there.

I suggest though that certain characteristics of atrium architecture remained attractive and/or useful, notably the impluvium, and they continued to be used within new structures for these advantages. The pools under consideration here are very reminiscent of impluvium pools in position and use and, in my view, trace their origins back to the atrium.[97]

---

[91] The correlation between atrium and impluvium is very strong at Pompeii; evidence is much harder to find at Rome but the physical evidence from Rome of whole ground plans is very sparse (for comments on these areas see Tamm1973).
[92] The atrium had an important place in villas and may be found for example at Oplontis, at the Villa Arianna and so on. Romizzi 2001 has analysed whole villas into various types including atrium, atrium and peristyle, and peristyle and atrium, an exercise which she freely admits is fraught with difficulty.
[93] Dwyer 1991 for all these ideas.
[94] Again see Dwyer 1991. Tamm 1963 91-102 looks at the terms atrium and vestibulum, what they appear to have signified and how they appear to have functioned in the context of the imperial dwellings in Rome during 1st century AD
[95] Ball 1994 213-318.
[96] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Figs. 21 and 22.
[97] This is not necessarily true of all pools catalogued by Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 at Ostia as Fontane 'Vasche tipo impluvium' – predominantly found in open-air courtyards where they probably replaced peristyle pools rather than impluvium pools – though this is an area which would repay further investigation at Ostia.

In 79AD the impluvia of Pompeii, from where the most detailed evidence comes, remained in their position in the atrium, and (usually) still carried out their ancient function of rainwater drainage and collection for the household cistern, with the open roof above functioning as light well. However they might be lavishly decorated - with marble facings, fountain jets, basins, pedestals, freestanding decorative sculpture and fountain figures.[98] They might take different shapes or add planters and bases.[99] It is also evident that the view right into the house from the street entrance was consciously punctuated and focussed to impress.[100] A jet playing in the impluvium demonstrated that the house was connected to the piped water supply. The glitter of the pool, and its jet or jets, had a role to play in the long view created into the inner parts of the house, together with the framing doors, windows and columns, the contrasts provided by dark and light areas, and the particular works of art on view.[101] During the first century AD there are clear signs that the impluvium pool in this manifestation – small, shallow, glittering, forming a shaft of light with the opening in the roof above, punctuating a long view – was being utilised elsewhere within buildings as discussed below.

5.2.4 Comparisons with the Villa

Here I have concentrated on the evidence from what appear to be larger dwellings for the use of pools in new ways. First, the structure under the Temple of Venus and Rome, at Rome.[102] Although we do not know how this functioned in the larger building, it was evidently a richly decorated central room, circular or octagonal in plan, approximately 8m diameter, roofing unclear, intersected at right angles by four barrel

---

[98] Andersson 1990 208-214 a conspicuous example. Andersson 1990 212 n.26 lists 28 impluvia with pedestals (including 10 with basins on pedestals). At 214 n.39 she also lists 15 impluvia with central outlet fountains.

[99] George 1998 represents this as the incorporation of peristyle elements in the atrium; see also Maiuri A 1929a 169ff on the elaboration of the impluvium generally at Pompeii. Cruciform pool - House of the Corinthian Atrium (atrium also planted), Herculaneum V 30 (Jashemski 1979-1993 I Fig.90); there is also a cruciform peristyle pool at the House of Galba Herculaneum VII 2 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.558). Raised edges and planters: House of Loreius Tiburtinus, Pompeii II 2 2 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II No.133); House of the Relief of Telephus, Herculaneum Ins.or.I 2-3 (Jashemski 1979-1993 I Fig.91 and Cat.561).

[100] Another example of the influence of the atrium in the design of these views comes from the House of the Mosaic Columns at Pompeii (Kockel and Weber 1983). Here the passageway from the street led to a garden but placed in the axial view were 4 mosaic columns surrounding an impluvium-like pool with, terminating the view, a mosaic niche fountain in the wall behind.

[101] Bek 1980 passim; she deals particularly with the creation of similar long views from triclinia.

[102] The date, and whether the building had anything to do with the Domus Transitoria, are disputed but need not concern us here since it is certainly 1st century AD or earlier. MacDonald 1982 21ff and LTUR II 92 Domus Domitiana for full bibliography.

vaulted corridors. There was a screen of four columns across (at least) one of these corridors, set back a little from the central room, and beyond the screen was a white marble-lined pool measuring with edging 4 x 3m. What lay beyond the pool, whether there was a gap in the ceiling above, and whether there were similar screens or pools in the other corridors, is not known.[103] The gap between the plinths for the columns would have been about 0.4m,[104] so although not a complete barrier, the narrowness of the gaps did not encourage people to walk through the columnar screen. Similarly the gap between the pool and the corridor wall is only about 0.7m. The overall design of the central room and corridors bears no resemblance to an atrium and its appendages. It seems that the pool/screen combination was not intended for walking through or round but as part of the view into – or more probably primarily from – the central room, whose unusual design suggests it functioned as rather more than the convenient junction between passages intersecting at this point.

At Minori (Hotel S. Lucia) there is a mid 1st century AD barrel-vaulted room with a rear extension containing a fountain and at the centre of the main barrel vault a light well measuring $2m^2$ with a pool beneath.[105]

There are examples of pairs of shallow pools inside buildings from both the Domus Aurea and the Domus Augustana.[106] The shallow white marble-lined pools on the upper level of the east, Oppian, wing of the Domus Aurea[107] had the mixtilinear sides and solid central base which occur in other 1st century small pools.[108] Since they were surrounded up to the edge with opus sectile and there are column bases on the edge, I infer that the marble floor area was roofed and that both areas had the basic appearance, but not the location or function, of the Corinthian-type atrium with

---

[103] Physical remains of column bases are recorded for only one corridor but two screens are reconstructed by for example MacDonald 1982 Fig.3 and Kähler 1950 Abb.13. Kähler 1950 Abb.12 has screens across all corridors – since the columns were very close set, this would effectively render the central room only awkwardly accessible from any direction, which seems unlikely.

[104] Barosso 1940 Fig. 1.

[105] Letzner 1999 Cat.32: there are few further details here or elsewhere, particularly of the fountain connected to the pool.

[106] There is also possibly a pair of small courtyards, functioning as light wells, with basins, in the Domus Flavia (Fig.132 7 and 9). These are identified by Kähler 1950 103 especially n.101 (picked up by MacDonald 1982 54). However Petrignani 1960 68, with a detailed plan, does not recognise the pools described and says one of the rooms had a door in the 'basin' wall. Neuerburg 1965 does not have these structures.

[107] Fabbrini 1982 19 and especially Tav.4

[108] The channels left by the removed pipe work here strongly suggest that three and probably four symmetrically placed jets surrounded the central block, whether or not it had its own jet. Fabbrini 1982 19 reports remains of bronze pins for the attachment of sculpture on the edge of the pools. Fig.130.2 shows another example from an outdoor context.

impluvium. There are rooms with a view through doors and columns to these pools but none has a dominating position so that the prime role of these watery rooms appears to be decorative, and to bring light and air into the surrounding areas.[109]

On the lower level of the Domus Augustana there is another pair of pools with mixtilinear sides (Fig.133 11 and 13, Fig.136.1 and 2).[110] Here the impression that the light-well function was important is very strong, even today. Walls extensively pierced with huge windows surround the pools.[111] Although there is no space for walkways round them, the basins have been placed to one end of the space available leaving a larger floor area at the short north end, where the water entered, strongly suggesting space was being made for the placement of sculpture.[112] The water and light would have been visible from all the surrounding rooms and corridors but room 9 and its pair on Fig.133 are the only ones axially placed to enjoy the full length view of the pools with whatever sculpture was placed at the point of entry of the water.

Outside this suite of rooms there is evidence of another unusual use of floor pools in the colonnade of the large peristyle (Fig.133 7). There were apparently 8 white marble-lined floor pools, two each side, crossing the full width of the floor from the external wall of the suite to the external piers of the peristyle colonnade (Fig.135.2, not shown on 133).[113] Although only about 1m wide, they would have been awkward to cross in walking round the colonnade, if bridges were not provided as well. Wataghin Cantino 1966 restores the colonnade as a barrel-vaulted corridor, moreover she restores another barrel-vaulted corridor immediately above on the upper level of the Domus Augustana.[114] This implies that there can have been no compluvium-type opening for light in the ceilings above the pools, since that opening would have constituted a hole in the floor of the upper corridor. There is no recorded evidence for

---

[109] Fabbrini 1982 12 also records a pair of triangular pools on this level which have apparently been used to fill two odd corners. Their relationship with the surrounding architecture is not clear and there is little which can usefully be said about them on the information available.

[110] They are not however an exact pair. The windows on the east side of room 13 have been partially blocked to form niches and the large window at the north end has also been part blocked. There is something resembling a pedestal with water steps at the north end of 13, but nothing similar remains in 11. Although the pools are fully open to the sky they are entirely encased by buildings and thus belong in the 'inside' rather than 'outside' category of pool.

[111] The distribution of windows on the two long sides of each room is not however symmetrical.

[112] Another consequence is that none of the openings in the long walls are lined up with the niches of the pool walls (visible Fig.136.1). There would have been greater correspondence had the pools been placed centrally in the space available

[113] Wataghin Cantino 1966 34-36.

[114] Wataghin Cantino 1966 Tav. IV, V, IX.1 and IX.2.

how the waterworks in the central pool, with its internal pelta shapes, functioned[115] but maybe the 8 floor pools were channels rather than pools, either supplying the central pool evenly from all sides or taking away overflow water similarly. In this reading the functional channels were left uncovered in the colonnade for decorative effect.[116]

Finally, from a Hadrianic pavilion complex in the Horti Sallustiani, come two small pools placed under windows in small side rooms off the main rotunda.[117]

5.2.5 Pools with architecture at the Villa

There is a series of pools reminiscent of impluvia at the Villa as well as some which take the indoor pool in a different direction. Under the first heading we can group the two pools in the side suites of the main building of the Water Court, the pool in the north hall of the Stadium Garden and, more distantly, the two pools in the Arcaded Triclinium (Fig.68 17 and 28, Fig.55 12, and Fig.46 7 and 15 respectively) All these pools are simple rectangles and do not have the complex internal niching found in indoor and outdoor pools in the mid- to late-first century AD, nor do they have the built central features found in pools like those described on the upper level of the Oppian wing of the Domus Aurea or for example at the House of Loreius Tiburtinus (Fig.130.2).[118]

Although there is no conclusive proof that the Water Court side pools were roofed as Tuscan atria, that is the most convincing reconstruction.[119] In this position and reconstruction they function with their compluviate roofs as light wells (particularly important here since the three surrounding rooms have no windows), as collection points for water running off the roofs, and as glittering components in long views through columnar screens with alternations of dark and light areas. The pool in the Stadium Garden fulfils a similar role though since the hall probably had windows, it

---

[115] Or for water ingress/egress from the floor pools.
[116] Another interesting and maybe unique set of floor basins is recorded under the west oval pool of the Domus Flavia (Carettoni 1949 61ff, see also Fabbrini 1982 n.7) – at least three and maybe five or more, approximately 2.5m square, arranged in a line. The very sparse evidence suggests however that these were outdoors.
[117] Lehmann-Hartleben and Lindros 1935, rooms K and L especially pp200, 220-1.
[118] A feature which continued elsewhere in the mid second century too – for example the recently uncovered block in a pool in a courtyard at the Casa di Diana at Ostia. The central element in the shallow pool has niched sides and the design incorporates inset basins as well as water steps (Marinucci 2001).
[119] For the reasons given by Rakob 1967 69 and as reconstructed Abb. 8 and 9.

was less important as a light source. There are statue pedestals in the room and it is tempting to increase the resemblance to an atrium by supposing portraits were set on them. The pools in the Arcaded Triclinium were in small unroofed, probably gardened areas,[120] but they are close set with buildings and have been positioned in exactly the same way as transitional points in a long axial view alternating dark and light. The east basin is larger than the west. The doorway to the seven-room suite in the east is also larger than the doorway to the Angled Terrace to the west. From the point of view of the visitor entering from the Angled Terrace, this would serve to equalise the apparent size of pools and openings in the long view through to the elevated (probable) dining room. From the point of view of the dining room, the impression of the distance of the long view would be enhanced by the artificial reduction of size of the more distant elements.[121]

A judgement of the impact and significance of the central fountain and pool of the main Water Court building (Fig.68 20) depends on a prior judgement as to whether or not it was roofed – the different opinions are conveniently summarised by MacDonald and Pinto 1995.[122] The presence of the opus sectile floor around the fountain and basin, with no apparent provision for drainage of rainwater (such as guttering round the edges), other than the central pool, argues,[123] with other factors, for some form of covering, probably a light one as MacDonald and Pinto 1995 suggest. If roofed, a central oculus seems very likely,[124] bringing light to the middle of the large room, the possibility of the interest of a 'travelling spotlight' around the room (such as at the Pantheon and Domus Aurea octagonal room), and providing a further contrast of light and shade in the views across the main room.[125]

---

[120] Typical garden gutters along the colonnaded edge, no evidence of flooring.
[121] Kähler 1950 127.
[122] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 100 and notes.
[123] Most opus sectile floors at the Villa were, clearly and unequivocally, roofed and most writers would take the presence of opus sectile as indicating a roof, but not necessarily a concrete vault, even where the form cannot be traced with certainty. De Franceschini 1991 is the only recent writer to argue that the main area of the Ceremonial Precinct (Hall of the Doric Pilasters) and the central hall of the Arcaded Triclinium, both with opus sectile floors, were nonetheless unroofed (advanced at her PD3 and 4). Guidobaldi 1994 259 is firmly of the view that unroofed opus sectile floors are very unlikely and specifically unlikely at the Ceremonial Precinct and Water Court.
[124] I am not aware of any previous examples, but the possible combination is too simple and appropriate to ignore. There was no pool under the oculus of the Water Court Vestibule, or the octagonal room at the Domus Aurea. There appears to be no evidence for example of a central pool at the Pantheon, but there were drains under the floor there possibly to deal with the problem of water entering, and MacDonald 1982 100 notes a slight crowning of the floor which would assist drainage, though this may be a feature introduced when the floor was re-laid in modern times.
[125] Another location in the Villa where a long view was clearly important is the Island Enclosure – from a niche in the ring wall to the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure. Here again the view is punctuated

The pools in the Water Court Vestibule and Fountain Court feature 4 do not function in the same way. The pools under the large windows in the former (Fig.68 2), if they were ever brought into use, would have reflected light into the roof but they do not function, as the other pools do, in views through. As pools under windows they are similar to the contemporaneous examples from the side rooms of the Horti Sallustiani pavilion, but here they are in the main room. Fountain Court feature 4 is a more intriguing feature – a polygonal pool, large in relation to its setting, set in a white marble floor (Fig.27). Although surrounded by buildings, it is not clear whether this room was roofed. In the room there are several fragments of mosaic floor which do not come from it and it has been suggested that these came from the ceiling/floor above.[126] They may alternatively have finished up in this room when cleared from another adjoining room at some time - they have certainly been gathered together in a fairly neat pile at some point. The room is such an odd shape that it would be difficult to vault it in concrete. It is not clear from other evidence whether Fountain Court West had a first floor at this point (it certainly did over the main rooms) and any form of solid ceiling would result in a rather dark room with only the portico door for direct light.[127] With no ceiling and a floor composed entirely of white marble, the room would have been a dazzling source of light, yet it does not function as a light well for any other rooms.

Roofed or unroofed, the room walls were pierced only by doors and the room was linked to the main Fountain Court West suite (and not to the more utilitarian room on the other side, Fig.22). However it was not part of the main entrance approach and is subsidiary to the main rooms. What the actual use of this room was, beyond providing running water within the building, is not at all clear. The surrounding architecture gives ambivalent information as to the overall function of Fountain Court West, and indeed there may have been multiple functions. The idea that Fountain Court East and West were libraries has long been dismissed. The very deliberate (as compared to the adjoining Republican buildings) north orientation suggests summer usage for the lower floors, while the upper floors were heated for winter. Other suggestions – dining,

---

by framing, contrasts of light and shade and water – this time in the shape of the canal around the Island, the fountain in the middle, and the full stop of the wall fountain at the end.

[126] De Franceschini 1991 calls these fragments BG12a

[127] Gusman 1904 97 believes it was in a dark room lit only by doorways, Kähler 1950 42 conversely refers to the setting as a courtyard rather than a room. Guidobaldi 1994 BB13 90 thinks it probably unroofed.

shrine to Antinous, general living rooms – can neither be proved nor disproved by the architecture.[128]

Conclusions

This Chapter has not attempted an exhaustive typology of pools but looked for the defining characteristics of the Villa pools and a context for them. Thus for example I have focused on large pools in the first part of this Chapter because of the number of very large pools at the Villa and on indoor pools in the second part because they are again numerous and appear to have a distinct role to play. Another more broadly based study might usefully investigate wider patterns in the use of pools comparing say Pompeii and Ostia, and other town sites

There is no unequivocal evidence at the Villa that any of the outside pools was used for swimming, or fish keeping and the long shallow pools were probably unsuitable because of their lack of depth. Aquatic displays could have been staged in two large deep pools, the Scenic Canal and the East West Terrace Pool. While all the outside pools continue a tradition of displaying stretches of water, often in gardens, they have apparently original features too (for example the integration of the Scenic Canal with the Triclinium, the external niching of the Peristyle Pool and the scale of the raised tank, the shape of the pool in the water feature adjoining the Water Court). In some cases the pool had a role in the creation of a longer view (for example the whole north south axis of the Stadium Garden, the Scenic Canal leading into the Triclinium), in other cases the pool stood free for walking round (the Peristyle Pool, the East West Terrace Pool). As a group, the outside pools split between those which displayed deep essentially still water, and those which used shallow and probably moving water.

The second century Villa outdoor pools differ in detailed points of design with some 1st century AD trends, so far as they can be ascertained from the patchy evidence. Pools (large and small) with complex internal niching appear from the mid 1st century AD at Rome. There is a long thin pool with very complex niching, for example, in the

[128] See MacDonald and Pinto 1995 71f and 80f for summary discussion. The suggestions at De Franceschini 1991 399 that they functioned as a pair of atrium like entrances to the Villa seems implausible both in terms of architecture and location in the Villa.

upper Oppian level of the Domus Aurea.[129] In Campania complex niching of the internal walls appears occasionally,[130] consistent perhaps with the greater expense of the work and the disruptive effect the earthquake had on building activity prior to complete burial early in the Flavian period. In the Flavian period at Rome pools with mixtilinear sides were prominent on the Palatine (no less than 6 examples in the Domus Flavia and Augustana)[131] plus a new discovery in Vigna Barberini.[132] The niched interior side walls of the long pool at the Schola del Traiano at Ostia dating from the second century shows they were still being constructed then. However these mixtilinear sides are completely absent from the numerous outdoor pools of the Villa (with the very minor exception of the small low level basin of Fountain Court feature 2). Given the quantity of pool examples at the Villa, this strongly a personal preference, drawing on a longer tradition of large simple shapes.[133]

The outdoor pools at the Villa are simple rectangular shapes, but not square,[134] whereas the three Domus Flavia/Augustana outdoor pools are all square (or virtually square) and indeed, unlike the Villa pools, almost exactly the same size.[135] This particular difference is discussed further at 10.2.2. With the possible exception of the terminal features of Fountain Court feature 3, caissons – planted watertight containers within pools – are also absent from the Villa though they figure prominently again in the Domus Flavia/Augustana, and also occur in Campania.[136] In general it seems that

---

[129] LTUR II Domus Aurea 60 and Fig 25 with other bibliography. There are traces of other pools with complex niching from the period of Nero – one on the Palatine under the west oval basin of the Domus Flavia (Carettoni 1949) and the other under the Sette Sale (Cozza 1974, De Fine Licht 1990 97-98, Fabbrini 1982 7 n.7). However the complete shape of these pools is not known and in particular the Sette Sale example so far as I can see belongs to a niched wall (no evidence for spouts) fronting and above a very narrow pool (in the fashion of the Bagni di Livia), rather than being a niched pool containment wall. Finally, in the open area numbered 20 in the modern numeration of the lower floor of the Domus Aurea wing on the Oppian, part of a pool featuring mixtilinear walls has been revealed. Although this has been restored in drawings as a long thin pool with articulated edges for the full length, so far as I am aware, only a central part with curved edges has actually been recovered archaeologically (Segala and Sciortino 1999 Fig. 48).

[130] For example long thin pool at House of Julia Felix II 4 (Fig.126.2); House of Diomede, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.573f; House of Meleager VI 9 2, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.254; Villa dei Papyri long thin pool, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.606f.

[131] Fig 132 10 and 19, 12 and 14; Fig.133 11 and 13 (these particular plans do not show the niching in all cases),

[132] Full dimensions not known, buried under Hadrianic structures (Vigna Barberini 2001 65).

[133] Many examples – Oplontis, San Marco, Quintilius Varus, Villa delle Grotte (Elba) and so on.

[134] For the purposes of this analysis I have ignored the gentle rounding of corners or sides such as occurs at the East West Terrace pool or the Domus Flavia pool (Fig. 132 no.19) which softens but does not essentially alter rectangular shapes.

[135] Fig.132 10 and 19 plus Fig 133 7. See also Cesare Baronio pool n.70 above

[136] Fig.132 10 (probably), 12 and 14; Fig. 133 7; Oplontis Room 16 (Fig.125). See also Cesare Baronio pool n.70 above. The occurrence of such islands within large pools is discussed in the context of the Island Enclosure at 7.1.

fussy elements within pools large and small as the Villa are avoided and they appear to be a strongly Flavian characteristic in Italy. They are reflected in a slightly different way by an unusual design from Luni[137] from about the same time, where a narrow deep canal is used to divide an outside porticoed area into four roughly octagonal parts, each part probably being covered with planters, and fountain set on protrusions round the edge and in the centre. The design is described as baroque and sculpted.[138]

Finally, earlier long pools tend to be deeper than the shallow examples at the Villa – from a metre upwards.[139] At the Villa shallow water and movement has been deliberately chosen for some pools and whereas it might have been possible to keep fish in earlier examples and in some cases holes in wall suggest this, this seems less likely in the long shallow Villa pools.[140]

As for the indoor pools, there are a number at the Villa which are not located in atria but which draw on the decorative possibilities of the impluvium/compluvium pairing as previously developed in atria and utilised in the creation of long views through from street to, often, garden, and perhaps wall fountain. This exploration of the possibilities of the interior floor pool was already underway in the first century AD, but at this time pools with mixtilinear sides were also popular, in contrast to the simple shapes preferred at the Villa. Simultaneously, in the first century and at the Villa, pools were being included in more unusual situations – perhaps with no roof opening (as around the lower peristyle pool of the Domus Augustana), maybe occupying a walled area (as in the twin rooms in the same area), or a position at the side of the room (as in the Water Court vestibule). As indicated at 5.2.2 there is no clear indication at the Villa of

---

[137] George 1997 Luni 2.
[138] George 1997 10.
[139] Long thin pool at House of Julia Felix II 4 more than 1m deep (Higginbotham 1997 207); House of M. Loreius Tiburtinus II 2 2 (Higginbotham 1997 210ff) upper pool 1.4m, lower 1-1.4m; Domus Aurea upper level Oppian 1.5m (Fabbrini 1982 8 - 5 piedi); Herculaneum palaestra long thin pool 2.35m (Higginbotham 1997 196). The depth of the long thin pool at Villa dei Papiri is not known. (Higginbotham 1997 would class all of these as potential or actual fishponds not just because of depth but also because of shade provision). A pair of (Julio Claudian) parallel long thin pools recently identified on the Palatine under the Vigna Barberini 1.5m deep (Vigna Barberini 2001 36 and Fig.13). Finally a long thin pool from Herculaneum (Casa del Genio II 3, Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.535), not fully excavated, 0.87m deep. There is insufficient information about two more very large long thin pools to check the argument advanced: Fosso Sanguisuga – at least 39m long and 5.4 wide, depth unknown (Higginbotham 1997 109 and earlier bibliography); Formia approximately 75 x 5m, depth unknown (Ciccone 1995 Fig 12 and key). The 6 long thin pools in the Flavian Templum Pacis garden in Rome were also, it appears from the latest published excavations evidence, 1m or more deep (*RM* 108 (2001) 195).
[140] Herculaneum palaestra pool and House of Julia Felix for example (see references in the last footnote).

locations where traditional dining couches might be arranged round a pool, indoors or out.

6. Block fountains, water steps and small deep walled up basins

Introduction

This Chapter looks at more minor aspects of the design of the water features of the Villa and their historical context. The block fountain has not previously been identified as a type but is repeatedly present at the Villa. Water steps are a recurrent characteristic as are small deep walled up basins, to a lesser extent. They are both aspects of water feature design which have received little or very dispersed coverage in the past.

6.1 Block fountains

6.1.1 Characteristics

The use of brickwork to create freestanding solid fountains is a recurrent feature at the Villa and the readily identifiable examples are one rectangular from Fountain Court (feature 1 of Cat.1 H2, Figs.22-3), two large rectangular examples from the East Terrace (Cat.1 H7, Figs.40-42), two octagonal structures from the Arcaded Triclinium (Cat.1 H10, Fig.50), one large rectangular from the Arcaded Triclinium (Fig.48), and six heptagonal from the north end of the Stadium Garden (Cat.1 H12, Figs.55, 62.2).[1]

Their common characteristics are:

- freestanding
- brick and/or concrete core, faced with marble
- angular in plan (not rounded)
- elevated
- no evidence of sculptured decoration beyond simple mouldings.

The Arcaded Triclinium examples all clearly stand in shallow catchment basins; the position is not clear for the others. They vary in size (the rectangular base from the Arcaded Triclinium measures about 3.7m wide, 12.2m long while the octagonal bases from the same complex are about 1.22m diameter). It is not possible to establish the

[1] Cat.1 exclusion 17 is another possible example. The nature of the structure at the centre of the Island Enclosure is not clear (Cat.1 H6) – it may also have been a single block fountain.

nature of point of exit decoration, whether simple or more elaborate spout, or fountain statue, for any of them.

The water was displayed in two different ways. The large rectangular base in the Arcaded Triclinium appears to have had the water overflowing to run down stepped sides (Fig.48.2),[2] whereas the other bases in the Arcaded Triclinium, the Stadium Garden bases and Fountain Court 1 must have had a central inlet jet of some form with the water caught in a shallow upper basin, with a side overflow (see Fig.50.3 for example).[3]

6.1.2 Surroundings

The octagonal bases in the Arcaded Triclinium, the Stadium Garden bases and Fountain Court 1 all appear to have been built with the aim of providing a view of a water display through, at the height of, and close to, a window.[4] The noise of water splashing would have been audible inside the room.[5] The Arcaded Triclinium large rectangular base on the other hand largely occupies a whole room, with surrounding colonnades and walkway.

6.1.3 Origins and use at the Villa

There are no direct preserved precedents for the use and design of the smaller block fountains but a range of linked features which might have provided inspiration. Built fountain bases (often masonry and sometimes rectangular) are commonly found in garden pools in Campania, though they might not rise above water level.[6] Permanent table top fountains set in the centre of triclinia are found with the table on columns

---

[2] This may also have been the way bases on the East Terrace (Cat.1 H7) functioned too, though as the Catalogue entry explains, the nature of these structures is far from clear.
[3] At Fountain Court feature 1 the hollowing out of the core for an upper basin is still clearly visible, at the Arcaded Triclinium parts of the upper basins survive, but nothing survives of the upper parts of the Stadium Garden bases.
[4] The walls at the Stadium Garden north hall (Fig.55 12) are not preserved to window height. Taking into account the pedestals inside the room, alternating in position with the fountain bases outside the wall, Hoffmann 1980's reconstruction of windows above the fountains and between the pedestals is convincing.
[5] The pleasurable combination of window, water and noise, is referred to by Pliny *Ep.*V.6.23-24, but in relation to a pool (piscina).
[6] For example House of the Meleager VI 9 2 in a mixtilinear pool (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.254); Castor and Pollux VI 9 6 in peristyle pool (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.260); large rectangular fountain pedestal VI 1 7/25 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.200/201); pedestal in the large pool at San Marco.

made of stone or stonework.[7] The smaller block fountains at the Villa may thus be viewed structurally as a variation on this theme. Alternatively, as dining couches occurred both as movable furniture and as built constructions, and as tables were built in metal and wood but also more solidly in stone and in permanent constructions,[8] so here at the Villa elevated fountains which would perhaps normally appear as freestanding decorated stone objects have metamorphosed, for some reason, into solid built constructions.

The reason for choosing this form of smaller block fountain in these locations appears to be firstly that what was most important was not what was outside and below windowsill level, but what could be seen from inside the window. Through the window only the very top part would be visible with water jet, possibly with an elaborated nozzle, or a fountain figure. The lower part of the fountain could be simplified (and cheaper) and did not have to be carved of stone. Secondly, at the Stadium Garden and the Arcaded Triclinium the bases are set very close to the windows and walls (see for example Fig.50). Again, the aim seems to be to get the water close to the window. Externally the marble-sheathed angular blocks may have blended more harmoniously with the adjacent flat vertical surfaces than a more traditional style of fountain basin. These are most commonly round and usually displayed freestanding, to take advantage of their three dimensionality, or in niches which echoed their curves (as in the baths). A traditional round basin on one or more supports pressed tight to a flat wall is a less satisfying juxtaposition than an angular block whose solidity matches that of the adjacent wall.[9]

The only larger built fountain which can be examined properly is the Arcaded Triclinium rectangular block which is stepped and then sloped (Fig.48) and appears to have had spouts surrounding it and in the very top. This tapered top might of course have been faced with horizontally ridged marble panels which the water trickled down

---

[7] For example a built base with white marble top House of Trebius Valens III 2 1 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.156); masonry column with marble top House of the Silver Wedding V 2 1 (illustrated Jashemski 1979-1993 I 90 and discussed 91).

[8] At Pompeii I 11 7 for example in the atrium there is not just a built pedestal but also built, plastered, and painted table legs, found where normally marble would be expected.

[9] Fountain Court 1 is further away from the window and has the simplest design. The relatively large size and distance from the window perhaps argue for the placement here of something more elaborate than a straight jet.

(usually called 'shutter' form steps). Here there are other comparisons though no close ones.[10]

Built three-dimensional stepped fountains are known from Pompeii – most notably the one that forms part of the decoration of the lower canal at the House of Loreius Tiburtinus (II 2 2). Fig.130.2 shows features in common with the Arcaded Triclinium – the existence of steps, the surrounding pool, the surrounding pedestals (statue bases?).[11] Yet the steps are miniaturised within the design, whereas at the Arcaded Triclinium, they go all around and the summit is a giant tapered step. The Pompeii fountain is clearly related to a series of yet smaller step fountains, usually carved from a single block. These diverge still further from the simple but monumental form at the Arcaded Triclinium, with their more complex outlines and elaborate figured and figural carvings. They appear neither modelled on (nor to derive from models for) the Arcaded Triclinium construction, which is very simple.[12]

There are larger examples of substantial constructions in pools. At the Casa di Diana in Ostia there is a mid second century AD large rectangular fountain set in a shallow pool.[13] The design of the block is much more complex than the Arcaded Triclinium large block fountain, with niched edges to the block, basins in the top and water steps at either end. Another point of comparison for the Arcaded Triclinium rectangular block fountain is from the Domus Flavia, where the Triclinium (Coenatio Jovis) is flanked by a pair of (deeper) pools containing monumental oval built islands of complicated mixtilinear plan (Fig.131).[14] The pools are surrounded by paving, by columns on three sides and set close to the walls of the adjoining dining room on the fourth.[15] As Fig.131.2 shows these built islands would be visible through the windows

---

[10] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 103 compare it to an Egyptian mastaba tomb. There is some similarity in the shape though these tombs often contained elements more reminiscent of house architecture and also bore relief decoration; it is not clear why Hadrian would have chosen to single out one of the least prominent (and dramatic) forms of older Egyptian tomb in fountain form.

[11] The step fountain at the centre of a pool at the House of Apollo (VI 7 23, most accessibly illustrated at Zanker 1998 Fig. 81 and 82) has similar features to the Loreius Tiburtinus base.

[12] Miniature step fountains are discussed by Cuscito 1968, Galliazzo 1979, Lavagne 1998, Steinby 1989 243-246 especially footnotes and Farrar 1998 89ff. A monumental structure illustrated on the marble plan of Rome (LTUR III Minerva Chalcidica and Coarelli 1996) appears to be closer to the Loreius Tiburtinus type but it is poorly understood and the date is unclear.

[13] Marinucci 2001.

[14] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.175 but how and whether water flowed from the islands, rather than around them is not known – the niches are strongly suggestive of statues and maybe fountain statues. Nash 1968 I Figs 285 and 286 are illustrative of the very extensive modern restoration, also Gibson et al. 1994 Fig. 4.

[15] Gibson et al. 1994 Fig. 29 reconstruction.

of the dining room in a way not dissimilar to the way that the Arcaded Triclinium main room relates to the block fountain, though at the Villa the massive block is screened by columns rather than windows. The Villa block also does away with the complex niching of the Domus Flavia islands and appears unlikely to have had any figured sculptural decoration of its own (though some on top is just possible) and it was surrounded by statue pedestals.

Thus the Arcaded Triclinium rectangular block fountain is a simple but monumental design with no close comparisons. Other such blocks, even where smaller, are much more elaborate in design.

6.2 Water steps

6.2.1 Characteristics

Water steps are a recurrent feature in a number of different types of decorative water feature before Hadrian, and at the Villa, and their use and development has received little attention.[16] Almost all the examples we will be discussing have the following characteristics

- a flight of regularly formed steps
- faced with white marble
- dropping steeply
- not suitable for walking down

At the Villa water steps occur, in one form or another, at the

- Fountain facing the Island Enclosure (Cat.1 H5, Fig.35)
- Fountain stibadium (Cat.1 H8, Fig.44.2)
- Fountain room on the north side of the Residence block (Cat.1 H9 Fig.45.1-2)
- main suite of the Water Court (Cat.1 H14, Fig 74.2)
- Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H17, Fig. 88.1-2)
- Upper Park Fountain Wall (Cat.1 H19, Fig.93)

[16] Neuerburg 1965 99.

In addition they appear in the cavea fountains, discussed at 4.3, and in the block fountain in the Arcaded Triclinium, discussed above.

6.2.2 Origins

Whereas pools and spouts can have a practical purpose, and origins, enabling narrow mouthed containers to be easily filled directly and water otherwise to be drawn off for use, steps, which distribute water shallowly instead of concentrating it, are not a practical aid to the drawing of water[17] and are wholly decorative.

Those who express a view on the origins of the idea of water steps often refer to their being inspired by falls of water over rock in grottoes.[18] The kind of steps we are talking about at the Villa, with their completely straight line forms and white facings bear little resemblance to any natural feature, but if one is seeking a natural parallel, there is a far greater resemblance to water tumbling steeply between close set banks, over rapids and by means of small waterfalls, in the upper reaches of streams and rivers, where the water foams white, rather than grottoes. Tumbling falls of water within caves and grottoes themselves are in fact hard to find, and so far as I am aware there is no example of the Romans using a grotto with such a fall (nor of creating water steps within a natural grotto).[19]

It is true that water steps are often found in conjunction with decorative materials with alleged links with the grotto – pumice, shells, and the mosaic wall decoration which was becoming increasingly popular in the 1st century AD. Yet (as discussed at 8.1 for example) none of these materials were used exclusively in watery locations, and water

---

[17] Glaser 2000 414ff discusses the Greek evidence for early practical arrangements for the drawing of water in fountain houses. These can include steps down into the water drawing area, but these are not water steps as defined here.

[18] Neuerburg 1965 is the fullest, yet still very brief, exposition: '...l'esistenza di scalette d'acqua in alcuni esempi del I secolo d.C. è un chiaro richiamo all'abbondante sorgente che doveva esistere in alcune delle grotte' (44). Ginouvès, less specifically '[l'escalier de l'eau] transpose, dans le monde géométrique de l'architecture, les jeux de l'eau sur les rochers' (144 n.2). Farrar 1998 89 'recreated the cascading effect of natural spring water.'

[19] There are flights of narrow steps cut within the natural rock of the grotto of Matromania on Capri and these are sometimes cited as evidence of the grotto origins of the idea of water steps. I agree with Lavagne that far from these being artificially created to channel water seeping into the cave (there is nowhere to channel it to), they appear to be access steps (Lavagne 1988 563). This would in any event only suggest that artificial steps were being imported into a natural setting, not that the natural feature inspired the idea of steps.

steps were found in locations entirely devoid of any of these materials.[20] So in fact there is no clear association between water steps and grottoes as such. It seems unlikely that the use of water steps reflected a deliberate desire to evoke the grotto – especially where they were used in the open air. I suggest rather an attempt to create the noise and sparkle of a profusion of downward falling water, reminiscent, if anything, of a narrow and foaming mountain stream or waterfall rather than a cave-like source. Taylor 2003 suggests another viewpoint – that the water animates the steps as people animate a building or stairway,[21] and it is true that water displayed in this way brought movement to a water feature to a greater extent than pools or jets, or at least single jets, could do.

6.2.3 Occurrence before the Villa

Water steps were already being used in a wide range of different locations and ways by the close of the 1st century AD. They were not obligatory in any location, but an element of choice. They were located (most commonly) running from the bottom of niches, but could also be found occupying all or part of the niche, or freestanding. The pre-Hadrianic examples fall within the following broad categories.

6.2.3.1 Fountain rooms with steps forming part of the rear wall decoration

In these examples a single cascade formed the central focal point of the rear wall of the fountain room (as defined at 4.2) and usually it was framed by a niche and contained within the niche – the steps did not protrude beyond the front surface of the niche. Size varied greatly. The popularity of rooms with steps like these appears to have been exhausted by the end of the first century – there are no examples from the Palatine or

---

[20] Noted by Neuerburg 1965 44-45. Of course, in many cases the evidence is missing one way or the other, but for example at Pompeii where most of the water steps in single niche fountains are found with all three types of material, one example (a fine one) from the House of the Ephebe (I 7 10-12, Neuerburg 1965 Cat.18) has none of them. The two rooms with steps in their walls in the Bagni di Livia complex (Fig.135.1 A^3 and A^4, seem to have been faced with very fine marble on their floors (intarsia), and walls, and stucco on the vaults; the walls of the water steps were faced with white marble and granito bigio (Carettoni 1949 55ff; Grimal and Guey 1937 147) – no pumice, shells, or mosaic. Neuerburg 1965 also mentions the Octagon water steps in the Domus Aurea, and Minori. In the first case I think the evidence relating to materials used with the cascade itself is totally absent (but might well have been pumice), and though the room in front was certainly decorated with stucco and marble there was also mosaic and some shells. Minori was redecorated and altered in the Severan period and the present absence of pumice and shells in Room 14 is not conclusive as to original décor (Bencivenga et al. 1979 passim).

[21] Taylor 2003 253.

Castel Gandolfo and no examples from the Villa. Examples include two rooms from the Bagni di Livia complex (Fig.135.1. A^3 and A^4); the cascade entering Room 124 (usual modern numbering) of the Esquiline wing of the Domus Aurea (Fig.137.2);[22] the water steps in Room 45 (the Odysseus mosaic room) Fig.137.1 and 138;[23] a flight in the large fountain room at the Villa of Agrippa Postumus, Sorrento;[24] the Minori water triclinium;[25] three examples from Pompeii[26] and one from a drawing.[27]

In no case (so far as I have been able to ascertain), was there space for the display of statuary at the top of the steps.[28] In the Domus Aurea cascade in Room 45, there must surely have been some sort of picture and perhaps architectural framework on the wall above. In all cases there must have been some mechanism for collecting and disposing of the water at the bottom of the steps – sometimes we know it fell into a pool (for example at Minori). At the House of Julia Felix it 'disappeared' into a hole in the bottom step (to reappear in the pool at the middle of the dining couches). In many cases we do not know what happened to it, or the evidence has not been published.

The use of water steps as part of the decoration of fountain rooms was by no means ubiquitous – the vast majority of Neuerburg 1965's 'ninfei a camera' do not contain water steps.

6.2.3.2 Fountain walls with steps forming part of the wall decoration

Here the cascades appear outside in unroofed or very open structures as defined at 4.4 with little relationship to a grotto.

---

[22] There is no detailed account of this part of the Octagon suite, see Neuerburg 1965 Cat.143 and Letzner 1999 Cat.124, Rakob 1964 190. The cascade ran for 10m, though only part was visible, and was 3m wide. Given the dimensions and the additional drop at the end of the flight of steps, depending on the volume of water used, the roar of this feature could have been thunderous.

[23] These are unusual in that they apparently spring from the wall, not from or within a niche. Neuerburg 1965 Cat.144, Letzner 1999 Cat.71 (but note that most of the bibliography cited relates to wall and ceiling decoration of the room).

[24] Another very large set, whose presence can now be detected only by cuttings in the walls used to seat the risers and tread boards. The dating is not clear – Neuerburg 1965 Cat.14 second half of second century AD; Mingazzini and Pfister 1946 111ff Flavian (but still later than the rest of the villa).

[25] Bencivenga et al. 1979 Room 14, which considerably updates the Neuerburg 1965 Catalogue entry.

[26] The House of Julia Felix, VI 17 Ins. Occ. 42, and VIII 2 28.

[27] This drawing is reproduced by Neuerburg 1965 Cat.73, and is from Codex Destailleur B (this volume was believed lost by Neuerburg and others but has been rediscovered, see Gukovsky 1963). Neither the date nor the original location of this room are known but the overall design shown is consistent with the picture painted by the other examples.

[28] Though in the Domus Aurea (Esquiline Wing) Room 124 there appears to have been a platform near the bottom of the steps, in the middle (Fig.137.2).

The fountain wall in the Bagni di Livia suite contains the cascade at the centre of a slightly curved wall with two niches either side (Fig.135.1 'N'). The decorative material surviving does not include pumice, mosaic, or shells. There is only one example from Pompeii – at the Casa del Torello each of the three niches had water from slots. The centre niche had a pedestal but the two outer niches had narrow cascades within the niches. The decorative materials included pumice, mosaic, and shells. According to Andersson the dating may be as early as Augustan. The only other fountain wall from Pompeii does not contain water steps.[29]

Finally the House of Avidius Quietus in Rome had a niched wall with tall, very narrow and almost flat sets of water steps placed, not in niches, but almost flat on the wall. The date is disputed and may be as early as Flavian.[30] The decoration included pumice in large quantities and mosaic.

However the majority of earlier fountain walls do not contain water steps. There are no recorded examples of fountain walls, as defined above, with steps, from the imperial dwellings after the Bagni di Livia (Neronian)[31] and before Hadrian.[32]

6.2.3.3 Freestanding single niche fountains

There are 16 examples from Pompeii and Herculaneum which definitely contain water and I have concentrated on these rather than the few examples preserved elsewhere, usually not as well.[33] The majority have traces of pumice, and shell, and mosaic

---

[29] House of the Anchor VI 10 7 (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.27). The two flanking niches contained fountain statues but it is not clear where the water went. Andersson 1990 232 cites some other examples of three niche walls from Pompeii which are not fountains.

[30] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.163 says Antonine but Lavagne and Wattel De Croizant 1984 741 favour the earlier date.

[31] Castagnoli *ArchCl* 16.2 (1964) 190 has suggested a Vespasianic date for this wall.

[32] I have reviewed in particular structures classified by Neuerburg 1965 as ninfei 'ad esedra' or 'a facciata'. There is one example (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.164, Letzner 1999 Cat.390) from Via di S. Basilio, which is probably post Hadrianic according to the style of the mosaic though adjoining buildings contained Hadrianic brick stamps. Here 4 sets of steps (probably) carried water down to a semicircular pool. The upper part of the curved wall does not survive to a height great enough to discern if it was niched but the water came from a pipe running behind the steps.

[33] Pompeii: I 7 10-12, II 9 6, III 9 1, V 3 2, VI 8 22, VI 8 23, VI 14 43 (2 examples), VII 2 45, VII 4 56, IX 3 5/24, IX 7 25, IX 8 6, house outside Porta Marina (Letzner 1999 Cat.283), House of the Mosaic Columns (Via dei Sepolcri). Herculaneum: III 3.

decoration and are in gardens, usually against a wall. 8 of the 16 have water steps,[34] mostly within the niche, so water steps are common, but not ubiquitous. The prominence of the steps varies greatly – thus the steps in the House of the Large Fountain are small in width and height, while the very prominent steps at the House of M Lucretius, which run from the bottom of the niche, occupy the full width and are as tall as, the niche itself. The 'middling' example from the Casa del Gran Duca (VII 4 56) is illustrated at Fig.137.3. In several cases (but not this one though there is clearly a gap in the decoration for a figure) we know the subjects of statues placed at the top of the steps.[35]

6.2.3.4 Freestanding water steps

I have identified 3 examples from Pompeii where the steps have broken loose of the usual architectural framework. At the House of Loreius Tiburtinus (II 2 2), at the start of the lower canal, the water structure bears some resemblance to a single niche fountain but shelters under a roof, and a fountain statue is built into the parapet at the top of the short flight of steps at the front.[36] At the House of the Meleager a flight of 8 steps stood at the edge of the mixtilinear pool in the garden, and presumably there was a fountain statue on top of them.[37] At VI 7 23 steps were cut into a pedestal surmounted by a statue of Bacchus, seated, and water cascaded down them into a circular pool.[38]

There are a couple of single flight examples among the miniature step fountains (but most are designed to be viewed in the round, with four or more flights). These may have been set originally into walls, but the Pompeii examples above also suggest that they too might have stood free.[39]

---

[34] I 7 10-12, V 3 2, VI 8 22, VII 4 56, IX 3 5/24, IX 8 6, House of the Mosaic Columns (Via dei Sepolcri), Porta Marina.
[35] IX 3 24 Silenus; I 7 10-12 Pomona; VII 4 56 Silenus; IX 8 6 hermaphrodite? (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.506).
[36] Best illustrated at Jashemski 1979-1993 II Fig. 88.
[37] Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.254.
[38] Plan Zanker 1998 Fig. 81.
[39] See above n12 for miniature step fountains. The single flight examples are: from Aquileia (Cuscito 1968 280ff) with a reclining figure at the top of a flight of steps and from Villa Albani a Nile reclining at the top of a flight of steps (Bol 1989-98 II 196 No.320). At Casale Silvestrelli there is what appears to be a third single flight miniature step fountain but it is set into a full size niche. The niche is disproportionately large and perhaps the sculpture is a later addition of an inappropriate piece (Giuliani 1966, 211 No. 234, Settis *RivFil* 96 (1968) 481). The room itself is said to be Republican.

6.2.3.5 Other uses

The incidence of cavea type water steps – that is water steps taking the shape of theatre seating – is dealt with at 4.3. The use of water steps in freestanding block fountains is discussed at 6.1. In the former, the width of the steps is extended and curved. In the latter, separate flights of steps are set around a core shape.

6.2.4 Occurrence at the Villa

In the Fountain room on the north side of the Residence Block (Cat.1 H9, Fig.45.2)) I believe there may have been a couple of steps from the bottom of the single niche towards the floor. In all other examples from the Villa, the steps occur in multiple sets or are extended to run the full width of a feature.

Multiple sets of steps from niches occur at the Fountain stibadium (maybe 4 niches, Fig.44.2), in the Water Court rear fountain wall (5 niches, Fig.74.2), and the Scenic Triclinium (4 niches, Fig.88.1). In the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure there seem to be steps possibly running the full length of the wall between the bottom of the niches and the basin below (Fig.35.2). In the Scenic Triclinium, there are steps not just in half the niches, as stated, behind the stibadium but also running all along the wall between the bottom of all the niches and the curved canal (Fig.88.2). In all these cases, steps function to break or indeed elaborate the fall of water between the bottom of a niche and a lower basin, though there might still be a vertical drop between the end of the steps and the lower reception basin, as at the Scenic Triclinium. The Upper Park Fountain Wall, if the reconstruction at Fig.93 is correct, operates in much the same way – water held in a long canal drops over long shallow runs of steps before falling into a basin below.

Single niche water steps are hardly visible at the Villa – but neither are single niche water features.[40] Where multiple niche water features occur, now frequently in curved

[40] The probable example from the Residence Block is cited; the only other Hadrianic single niche fountain is in the East Belvedere, where there were almost certainly no steps. This is consistent with the similar niche at the rear of the Scenic Triclinium extension (although it is far from clear that this had piped water, see discussion in Cat.1 H17). Both are huge pumice-encrusted spaces which almost certainly contained large sculpture. Possibly the large steps which would have been proportionate would have detracted from the impact of the sculpture itself.

walls, multiple water steps are almost ubiquitous,[41] whereas previously they were uncommon.[42]

Lavagne has rightly pointed out that at much the same time as, or a little before, this multiplication was appearing in walls and rooms, the four (or more) sided miniature step fountains appear in the archaeological record, and this suggests a more widespread interest in the decorative possibilities of multiple steps.[43]

The use of continuous long runs of water steps at the Villa is not known from earlier locations[44] and is reminiscent of the cavea fountain. This is not to suggest that the idea was a Hadrianic invention (the cavea fountain clearly occurred much earlier) but at the Villa there appears to be a preference for smoothing the transition between niche floors and basin in this way.

The overall effect of multiplication and lateral step extension is that where previously the noise and sparkle of the water dropping over the steps focussed attention on a single point of interest, and this could produce, as for example at the Domus Aurea, a single feature whose noise and movement would dominate the rest of the room,[45] at the Villa the effect was spread so that there was a greater sense of being surrounded by the movement and noise of water. Neither the single nor the multiple variety of water step are in evidence in Domitianic water features (whereas there are two large single step examples in proximity at the Domus Aurea) and it may be that the Hadrianic period saw a revival of interest, with a new twist.

---

[41] The multiple niche fountains without steps are the Cistern Fountain (Republican), the Fountain room on the north side of the Residence Quadrangle (Republican), and the Fountain room south of the Water Court (Republican), plus the Small Baths Fountain Wall. This does not use steps but pedestals and basins.

[42] As seen above, there are no identified examples of multiple steps in earlier rooms even where this would clearly have been possible such as in the Pompeii examples. I have only identified two earlier examples of multiple use of steps among fountain walls prior to the Villa but multiple use was clearly occurring (this is not the impression given by Lavagne 1988 615).

[43] Lavagne 1988 615.

[44] Here I am substantially relying on the accuracy of the Catalogue descriptions of Neuerburg 1965 and to a lesser extent Letzner 1999. These longer runs of shallow steps are not always easily recognisable and it is not within the scope of this thesis to examine the source documentation for every Italian Catalogue entry. However, where I have checked, I have not found them. A clear later example is at Minturno (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.55, Letzner 1999 Cat.302) where 4 marble covered steps run around the curved rear wall of a basin, below niches. It is not known how/whether the structure was roofed and the date is 2nd century AD or later.

[45] Thus, for example, while in Rooms 44/45 at the Domus Aurea, there was much to please and interest the eye on the walls and ceiling (including the famous, but not actually very large, Odysseus mosaic panel) the dominant feature of the room originally would undoubtedly have been the large, central, water steps, and whatever decorated the wall above them.

There is also a strong preference at the Villa for leaving space for statuary or some other form of visible decoration at the top of steps.[46] Most of the steps start from the bottom of niches and even the Scenic Triclinium steps in the niches behind the stibadium do not occupy the full height of the niche (Fig.88.1-2). Although pumice and mosaic are clearly very much present in the Scenic Triclinium, very little is known of the subjects of its pictorial representation and statuary. Pumice is not known from any of the other Villa step locations except the Upper Park Fountain Wall. Lavagne sees the Scenic Triclinium with pumice and its steps as still reflective of the grotto but I do not think this evidence justifies this conclusion.[47] He notes that the known decorative subjects of the miniature step fountains are substantively marine, nymphs and so on, and one might add that the subjects of the decoration associated with water steps at Pompeii are overwhelmingly marine, garden, Bacchic, animal or otherwise playful. The finest example of a triclinium with prominent and focal water steps yet discovered at Pompeii (VI 17 Ins. Occ. 42) is decorated extensively with garden scenes and the only subject known from the House of Julia Felix is a Nilotic scene. In short, just as pumice was no longer uniquely associated with water or grotto features,[48] water steps had long since ceased to be a feature solely utilised in or strongly redolent of the grotto, if they ever had been.

6.3 Small deep walled up basins

6.3.1 Characteristics

In some cases a single niche itself or the area just in front of it, was walled up to create a deeper pool. This situation is distinguishable from fountain walls with multiple niches, and from the single niche mosaic fountains found particularly at Pompeii, where the water flowed from the niche into a basin in front which was at ground level and shallow. The design has not been treated by the fountain cataloguers as a type (the examples are classed as grottoes, fountain rooms and so on) and here I am treating it rather as an aspect of water feature design rather than a class, and one whose use has been little noted. The examples of this at the Villa are the fountain in the Republican

---

[46] Unlike in the earlier room cascades listed above at 6.2.3.1.
[47] Lavagne 1988 615.
[48] Occurring for example in the planted niches in the garden wall facing the triclinium at the House of Julia Felix.

cryptoporticus (Cat.1 R4), the barrel-vaulted room at the south end of the Stadium Garden (Cat.1 H12), the Fountain room below H15 (Cat. 1 H16), and the four corner fountains in the Water Court main building (Cat.1 H14).[49]

6.3.2 Origins and precedents

There were probably far more of these simpler, smaller, constructions than are now recognisable in the archaeological record – the front wall was usually the thinnest and most likely to decay and disappear with time. Neuerburg traces the origins of the 'esedra' fountain to the single semi-circular niche with basin and says that the earliest examples predate the appearance of fountain rooms.[50] The clearest early example (second or first century BC) is from the villa 'Le Pianelle dei Signori Reali' where an arched niche, set into the hillside, is walled up into a deep basin by slabs of stone.[51] At Palestrina a similar arrangement was closed at the front by slabs of travertine.[52] One of the terracotta models from Locri illustrates a simple single niche fountain with a high basin.[53] Another example with features in common with the Villa, and only a little later, is from the Villa dei Quintili (Fig.136.3).[54] Here a deep basin with a high front wall lies in front of a curved wall with a large central niche (and a smaller niche further round each side of the curve, barely visible from the front when the structure was complete). The structure opens onto a paved courtyard, but may itself have been roofed. At the Fontana di Re Carlo, near Veii, dating from the 2nd or 3rd century AD, the walled up basin is large (3.2 x 2.3m) and about 0.8 deep, the size suggesting here a desire to hold a larger quantity of water, covered, perhaps for practical purposes.[55]

From an earlier date, and for practical reasons (ease of inserting larger containers to be filled), deeper draw basins appeared in fountains with a clear water supply function. At Pompeii, and presumably after the aqueduct water supply was installed, these

---

[49] Possibly there was also a walled up basin in the Island Enclosure, see Cat.1 H6 and Ueblacker 1985 23.
[50] Neuerburg 1965 54.
[51] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.211. It is unclear why he categorises this as a fountain room (41) since the structure later added in front, which is in any event later, is clearly identified as a cistern and not therefore a 'room'.
[52] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.102.
[53] Neuerburg 1965 Fig. 8. Neuerburg 1965 gives a couple more early examples (from the Villa of Brutus Cat.205 and 209, also 54) but these are not clearly recorded.
[54] To be distinguished from the monumental structure fronting onto the Via Appia. Our structure has not been fully published and is not in the fountain catalogues. It is A13 on Tav. 2 in Paris 2000 and in the earliest residential part of the villa, mid 2nd century AD.
[55] Ward Perkins 1955 52-54, with reconstruction drawing.

usually take the form in the street of simple stone basins with a spout jetting from a relief panel which was erected at right angles at the back,[56] but at the Arch of Germanicus the basins were in front of niches.[57] In a different context, but still very much connected with meeting a need to provide large numbers of people with a convenient way of getting at water, the Colosseum had a large number of deep basins set under spouts in pilasters.[58] At Ostia, deep walled up basins are found regularly either up against a wall or in the corner of two walls, under a point of supply, in dwelling contexts where the use was practical and maybe also attractive.[59] So the form has practical as well as decorative antecedents.

Of course even if more sophisticated variations (larger, multiple niches) emerged from these origins, the original simple concept might still be chosen for particular places and this appears to be the case at the Villa.

6.3.3 The Villa

The niche in the Republican cryptoporticus is cut to the floor, but a wall was left in front to capture the water within the niche (Fig.12.2). The Hadrianic examples are rather more sophisticated. At the Stadium Garden the hooded hollow of the small barrel vaulted room at the south end created a dark central focus for the axial view (Fig.56.2) but closer to, the deep (0.6m plus) interior basin would have reflected light onto the pumiced interior (Fig.59.2).

The Fountain room below H15 (Fig.79) uses a walled up basin in one corner. Salza Prina Ricotti seems to think this is little more than a glorified horse trough.[60] However, the open court (unroofed) had a narrow doorway unsuitable for direct access by animals so that handlers would have had to leave animals and carriages waiting outside. If the point were to supply water for animals, other solutions would have been more practical – piping the water outside and providing a proper trough. The corner fountain seems far too sophisticated, and inconvenient, for this purpose. However it

---

[56] Eschebach 1982, passim.
[57] Eschebach 1982 Abb. 7 for the Arch of Caligula where there are no niches and presumably spouts from the piers jetted directly into the basins.
[58] Gabucci 1999 236ff.
[59] Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 II, Fontane classified as Vasche addossate a muro or Vasche angolari.
[60] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 107: 'Una fontana offriva la possibilità di rifornirsi di aqua per gli animali'.

does seem plausible that the area was a point of arrival for human guests invited to the Water Court complex (Fig.78), where they might disembark from their transport, and pause for cleansing and refreshment using the deep pool in the large niche, before making their entrance to the Water Court itself.

In the Water Court main building, the best preserved of the four corner fountains in the main room is illustrated at Fig.73. The niche and basin were viewed through a large arched window (Fig.73.1) with the front basin wall functioning as its lower edge. Between the niche area and the central area of the room there was a further curved screen of columns. This viewing of niches through intervening planes formed by pierced walls and columnar screens is a familiar feature of architecture at the Villa in watery and non-watery locations. The very long axial views terminating with niches in the large complexes are discussed at Chapter 7. Shorter vistas through intersecting planes are still clearly visible for example into the pavilion suites at the front of and either side of the Scenic Triclinium (Fig.139.1) and earlier at locations like Oplontis (Fig.121.4). However it is hard to find parallels in a residential environment for the multiple corner water features found at the Water Court, which were only one part of the overall water landscape there. They go hand in hand with the choice of shape for the room, and the use of round or octagonal shapes for fountain rooms is discussed at 7.4.2.

Conclusions

There are no clear and direct precedents for the smaller block fountains and they appear to be a novel response to a particular desire to view water through windows, at window level. The large block fountain at the Arcaded Triclinium can only be compared with built fountains with much more complex features – it is monumental in size but simple in conception. Multiple sets of water steps and broad runs of steps occur frequently at the Villa in situations where the effect would be to surround the occupant or onlooker producing a more powerful and certainly different effect to the single runs of steps which occur in earlier contexts. The deep walled up basins which occur at the Villa are not in themselves splendid and can in other contexts be put to a simple practical use. At the Hadrianic Villa the idea is picked up and used at three places to more dramatic effect. Taken together these three particular aspects of water

feature design illustrate the sheer variety and flexibility of Roman water feature design and of its usage at the Villa

7. Large complex features

Introduction

In Chapters 4, 5 and 6 I have discussed the smaller decorative water features of the Villa, their historical context, typology and role, and largely set on one side the five largest and most complex architectural structures. Each of these complexes contains at least two and as many as five separate and distinct water features,[1] but each has a structural unity and needs to be considered as an ensemble. They are the Island Enclosure (Cat.1 H6), the Arcaded Triclinium (Cat.1 H10), the Stadium Garden (Cat.1 H12), the Water Court (Cat.1 H14) and the Scenic Triclinium and Canal (Cat.1 H17).[2]

In the fountain typological catalogues they have generally either been fragmented into their constituent parts, which does not help us to understand them, or omitted as not being fountains or 'ninfei'.[3] The Island Enclosure, the Stadium Garden and the Water Court have previously been the subject of detailed monographs, focussing mainly on the architecture.[4] The Arcaded Triclinium and the Scenic Triclinium and Canal have not, though they, especially the latter, have been much written about otherwise. In this Chapter I have attempted to address some of the open questions that remain about the architecture, evaluate the ideas which have been put forward about the function of all of them, and place them in the context of the development of water feature architecture up to the second cetnury AD.

The large features have common characteristics. It is apparent even in their present condition that each had long carefully constructed visual axes, alternating light and shade, marble and water, and in some cases plantings, axes which could be viewed but not walked:

---

[1] For example the Island Enclosure has the surrounding canal and a central fountain on the Island; the Stadium Garden has the long shallow outside pool, the inner pool, 6 block fountains, a cavea fountain, and a barrel vaulted fountain room.
[2] I am not dealing here with the Fountain Court complex here since the four features are widely distributed (feature 4 is not linked to the other three at all). Though they are set in a distinct Villa building group, comprising Fountain Court East and West and the associated terrace, they could arguably have been catalogued separately.
[3] See 3.2 for fragmentation especially by Neuerburg 1965; Letzner 1999 does treat the Scenic Triclinium and Water Court as ensembles, but in no depth. Both omit the Island Enclosure and Arcaded Triclinium as not meeting the definition (Neuerburg 1965 48 and 69 mentions in passing).
[4] Ueblacker 1985; Hoffmann 1980; Rakob 1967 and Giuliani 1975.

- Island Enclosure - 100m north south (Figs.33 and 38)
- Arcaded Triclinium – 100m east west including the width of the Stadium Garden (Figs.46 and.47.2)
- Stadium Garden – 100m east west including Arcaded Triclinium (Figs.55, 61.2); 140m north south (Fig.56.2)
- Water Court – 90m north south (Figs.68 and 72)
- Scenic Triclinium and Canal – over 150m north south (Figs.80, 83.1, 85.2, 85.3).[5]

Taking the Arcaded Triclinium as an example, the long view runs east from one of the points of entry (Fig.46 9), through the main fountain suite, the seven room suite (Fig.46 20-27), out through a large window in the alcove (Fig.46 21) and across the Stadium Garden, terminating in the Peristyle Pool Building (Fig.47.2). This view has been facilitated by wider intercolumniations in the colonnades (Fig. 46 9 and 17) and punctuated by pools (Fig.46 7 and 17) which almost certainly contained jets or sculpture.[6] The pools and parapets between column bases prevent the axis being walked. There is a view, not a passageway, and this is true of all axial views of the large complex features.

On the other hand none of the complexes has a view out onto the landscape[7] and in the first four cases, particularly, walls enclosed them almost completely. Within those walls architectural vistas were created, though the natural world was also included by means of water (especially the pools and flowing canals) and the inclusion of planted areas (particularly prominent in the large peristyle garden of the Water Court). The Scenic Triclinium and Canal are slightly different. Though in no way set in a 'found' landscape (the valley seems to have been deepened by excavation and the sides were terraced), the complex is not surrounded by walls (compare for example Figs.56 and 83.1). However, as discussed below, it too was self-contained.

---

[5] All compass points approximate.
[6] See Cat.2 C8 and discussion at 9.1.2 for possible contents..
[7] Viewing points did exist elsewhere at the Villa (for example the East and West Belvederes). The Water feature adjoining the Water Court (Cat.1 H15) is the only water feature with an external prospect.

7.1 The Island Enclosure – use and precedents

The Island had a clear practical use, having enough space of various types to qualify as a small functional dwelling.[8] Not everyone agrees on the exact usage of each space[9] but evidently there were baths (Fig.37 10,11,13), latrines (Fig.37 17 and 30), a small peristyle at the centre (Fig.37 32 and 33) and enough other space to segregate sleeping, working, eating and other forms of relaxation for a small number of people. The circular canal was intended, not necessarily exclusively, as a cold-water bath or swimming area; as the steps from the bath suite clearly indicate.[10] The overall function of the Island is clear,[11] and is consistent with a taste evidenced in the literary sources for private and exclusive space in a large dwelling. Augustus had a private space 'Syracuse' in his Rome house where he took refuge; Pliny had a suite of rooms at his Laurentine villa which were particularly pleasing to him because they were quiet and away from the rest of the house, especially during the Saturnalia.[12] An island location was ideal for privacy. Cicero had a real island in a river which was a favoured haunt for meditation, reading and writing, all solitary occupations;[13] Tiberius had a whole island, Capri. The dining area at the Sperlonga grotto is a small, exclusive island set in the water (Fig.129). The original retractable bridges made manifest the private nature of the Island though perhaps they were symbolic rather than in everyday use.[14]

Whether the concept of the island had greater significance for Hadrian, whether he was consciously alluding to or imitating other place(s), and what the precise architectural precedents were, are more difficult issues.[15] Kapossy[16] raises the question of whether

---

[8] Among modern writers, MacDonald and Pinto 1995 89 tend towards the idea that it was a place to visit, a studio or workplace, not a place to live, but admit there is a multiplicity of rooms. Salza Prina Ricotti believes that as one of the earliest new constructions at the Villa, it was specifically intended to give Hadrian a peaceful, private living space while heavy building work was going on all around (Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 129ff).

[9] See Cat.1 H6 for alternative interpretations of the function of specific rooms, but most people base their allocations of use on the idea that Hadrian 'took the atrium-centred villa, deconstructed its elements, and reconstructed them into an assemblage of circles and arcs' (Frazer 1996 78).

[10] The use of a circular swimming channel is not known elsewhere but in this context the idea is neat and practical.

[11] The proposal at Stierlin 1984 148ff of a cosmological role and a setting in which Hadrian might be presented as 'un dieu vivant' has not found favour elsewhere.

[12] Suetonius *Aug.* 72.2; Pliny *Ep.* II.17 20-24.

[13] *De Leg.* II.1.

[14] Cat.1 H6 describes how a single built bridge replaced them, perhaps because of practical problems.

[15] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 81-89, with footnotes, is a comprehensive summary of most suggestions.

[16] Kapossy 1967. Further references to similar ideas given at MacDonald and Pinto 1995 notes to 85 under 'have been likened'.

the Island is consciously imitative of the Island of the Blessed, and of other sacred and peaceful island symbols. In the search for more precise architectural precedents Torelli has recently revived the idea that the structure imitates an island surrounded by water at Sparta which was used for a contest of ephebes; however since this island was specifically a location for visible fighting, we can perhaps assume no-one lived on it and there were no buildings. His other arguments are not compelling.[17] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 on the other hand strongly favour the influence of a circular dwelling at Herodium.[18] This was certainly a suite with a garden and baths, and many other rooms, walled all around for privacy (and security) like the Island Enclosure,[19] but it was on top of a mound, and not surrounded by water. The physical condition and degree of occupation of Herodium at a time when Hadrian might have seen it is not clear.[20] Herod himself, building towards the end of the first century BC is likely to have been influenced by the luxury villas he had seen in Italy[21] (as might Hadrian) so identifying who was influencing who becomes somewhat circular.

The existence of other circular architectural structures – aviaries, tombs, tholoi, the Pantheon[22] – has been noted as possibly connected but as MacDonald comments, as a rule these did not contain internal architecture (nor, in particular, living spaces). Circular pavilions in gardens were used as living space (and there was one at the Villa on the Fountain Court Terrace, predating the Hadrianic buildings, see Cat.1 H2 and Fig.22). These might be isolated but they were not islands. Unlike garden pavilions, the Enclosure nestles at the centre of other major Villa building complexes (see its location 17 on Fig.1) and achieves isolation and privacy not by distance but by internally focussed design and protecting walls.

Natural islands were occupied – sometimes fully – by dwellings. The examples include not just the tyrant Dionysius I's occupation of the island of Ortygia,[23] but, very

---

[17] Torelli 1991 228 thinks the existence of two retractable bridges at both locations is significant but the two bridges can be explained otherwise at the Villa. Retractable is for privacy. At least one bridge was needed for access; it was placed off the main axis to avoid interrupting the line of sight, and provided with a pair to keep a symmetrical appearance on entry from the vestibule.
[18] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 87ff, with bibliography in footnotes. The physical condition and degree of occupation of Herodium at the time when Hadrian might have seen it, is not clear.
[19] Salza Prina Ricotti 1982 34 deals with security aspects of the Enclosure.
[20] Netzer 1981 78.
[21] Netzer 1981 109ff. Nielsen 1994 206ff lays greater stress on the influence of Hellenistic palaces on Judaean design.
[22] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 85, Frazer 1996 passim.
[23] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 85, picking up a suggestion by Coarelli.

much closer to the Villa in space and time, the occupation of whole islands off the coast of Campania and the west coast of Italy, by single Roman villas. However these islands were natural features whose geography to some extent determined the distribution of buildings on them, producing very different structures to the tightly contained, wholly artificial Enclosure. Thus, as matters stand, the Island Enclosure, in its artificiality, sophistication and complexity, remains a unique realised design.

However, looking at the Island Enclosure as a water feature, another relationship begins to appear, which has received little attention in the past, and which forms part of this complex picture of origins, derivation and allusion. There are a number of decorative pools in Italy with island like structures at their centres.[24] Evidence of a close parallel has recently been painstakingly extracted from the Neronian fragments of razed masonry preserved under the Domus Flavia – a rectangular pool over 40m square with a circular foundation in the middle, outer diameter over 30m.[25] The size of the Palatine island suggests occupation, temporary or longer term, rather than planting or statuary This had of course already disappeared under Domitianic buildings by the time of Hadrian, and in any event the use and accessibility of the central structure cannot be deduced from the fragments remaining,[26] but it hints at the previous existence of some large artificial pools with structures for occupation in the middle.[27]

There were other island-like structures in pools on the Palatine intended just for planting and statuary. The two oval structures in pools, either side of the great triclinium at the Domus Flavia, were raised to a substantial height (Fig.131). We do not know how exactly they combined planting, statuary, fountains and architectural elements but they were solid built structures elevated from the water, like the Island of Hadrian's Villa. There are spaces on the perimeter of the Island at the Villa which

---

[24] There is also a large deep pool (69.2 x 45.5m) at Herodium (Netzer 1981 10ff) with a round structure in the exact centre built like an island, diameter 13m. Details of the superstructure are not known (but Netzer reconstructs a tholos type).

[25] LTUR II 201 categorically states this was a prototype for the Island Enclosure. Full details are given in Cassatella 1986 and 1998.

[26] Cassatella 1998 282 suggests a lightweight structure, perhaps even Nero's famous revolving dining room.

[27] In the upper level of the Domus Augustana (Fig 132 19) there is also an island in a pool with a bridge connection (not shown on this plan, Higginbotham 1997 120-122 for details and further bibliography). However although the pool appears to be Domitianic, the island (measuring about 10 x 9m) and bridge may in fact be considerably later. They are built onto the lining of the pool and plastered rather than faced with marble. A late 3rd/early 4th century brickstamp has been found on the island

may have been used for planting or statuary.[28] Again on the Palatine, the occupation of a peristyle pool (Fig.132 10) with a low level structure of labyrinthine design, and the pelta shaped islands occupying most of the lower peristyle pool of the Domus Augustana (Fig.133 7) indicates an interest in almost filling pools with complex structures. The large circular structure with mixtilinear sides in a large rectangular pool (18 x maybe 40-50m) recently uncovered at Via Cesare Baronio may have been similar in design.[29]

Living spaces with various functions surrounded these large pools on the Palatine, with their solid internal islands. The islands themselves were intended, so far as we can tell, only to be looked at from the edge, or from above. They are not accessible but they do indicate existing models for putting large built structures with undulant outlines, in pools. At the Island Enclosure water instead surrounded living space, as on a natural island villa. You could walk the walkway round the canal and look at the Island, you could look through it, along the main axis, but it was designed to be occupied, and looked from, as well as looked at. The Island Enclosure may therefore be regarded as a fusion of the villa on the natural island with the artificial pool decoration. The Enclosure may not have been the first example of its kind, if the Neronian example on the Palatine is correctly understood.

7.2 The Arcaded Triclinium

7.2.1 The triclinium debate

Unlike the Island Enclosure, there are serious unresolved questions over the function of the Arcaded Triclinium.[30] Similarities with the design of the great triclinium of the Domus Flavia (Fig.132 13) have led many commentators to identify the function of the main room (Fig.46 5) as tricliniar.[31] This is neither proved by – say – permanent dining couches nor disproved by – say – a large pool in the middle. The presence of a large pavonazzetto slab in the middle of the floor has been inconclusively adduced in

---

[28] Fig.37 12, 15, 19,21, 25, 28.
[29] See also Chapter 5 n.70.
[30] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 103 use the title Triclinium with reservations.
[31] Kähler is usually credited but the parallel has been drawn as far back as Boussois and Martin 1913 265.

support of the dining room theory. Interpreting the significance of this slab is not straightforward and is discussed in detail at 7.2.2.

The internal features of the main room - the solidity of its south wall, with its highlighting niche, the columns down the east and west walls, all suggest that it was principally intended to be used with viewers facing north (where their view would be of the niche wall) or south (where their view would be of the large block fountain at the other end). There are no suitable curves for stibadia but plenty of space for more traditional couch arrangements for a good size gathering.[32] However the idea that the complex was a deliberate part of extended and fragmented dining arrangements spilling over from the Stadium Garden or indeed into the East West Terrace is less probable.[33] Only passageways connected the three complexes. If the Emperor were to dine with a large number of guests, it seems to me that one of the prime requirements was that he should be visible to them even if he never spoke to them.[34] He would simply not be visible to people not physically present in the main room of the Arcaded Triclinium with him; conversely were he to be dining somewhere in the Stadium Garden, he would be visible to virtually no one in the Arcaded Triclinium. The Triclinium is devoid of side rooms for retiring, and does have only one nearby latrine.[35] It seems to me that if the Triclinium were used for dining it would be the main central room only, housing a relatively small (by imperial banquet standards) number of people (the usable area is roughly half the size of the Domus Flavia triclinium), with the Emperor reclining at the south end, with the niche behind him.

---

[32] The reasons given at De Franceschini 1991 503 for thinking it not a triclinium are not convincing: no important water features (is this really a sine qua non even at the Villa? What about the pools and the block fountain?); no convenient places for couches (the same would go for the Domus Flavia triclinium); another triclinium not far away (there is no reason to think that distance between triclinia was desirable, multiple choice certainly was). At 510 she appears to think that the main room of the fountain suite was uncovered, not a view shared by any other modern author. Similarly arguments at Guidobaldi 1994 260 – too airy, no latrines (in fact there is one, see n.35 below), lots of other triclinia available – are not conclusive.

[33] See especially Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 Fig. 28, overspill to East West Terrace suggested 179.

[34] Statius' experience of dining as one of a very large number of guests with Domitian was of a magnificent hall with a thousand tables (reportedly), but he could nonetheless see the Emperor (*Silvae* 4.2).

[35] The seven-room suite has a stylistic unity which points to a separate not a subsidiary retiring room purpose. The latrine is located just inside the quadroporticus adjoining the Small Baths – on Fig.46 it is the protrusion from the Quadroporticus just touching the outer wall of 13.

7.2.2 The pavonazzetto slab(s)

A pavonazzetto slab (1.45 x 2.35m) in the middle of the opus sectile floor of the main room (Fig.46.5, visible in Fig. 47.1 and 2) has been interpreted as evidence in support of a dining use, marking the Emperor's personal dining position.[36] Bek supports the argument by stating that the slab is displaced 0.5m southwards compared to the east and west openings to the room (thus lining up the Emperor's view along the east axis, from his reclining position). The existence of this displacement is not borne out by the latest detailed plan,[37] nor noted by other illustrators. Bek's photographs[38] purport to show the displacement looking to the east and to the west but in both photographs the displacement is to the right. This is not possible. Therefore the displacement in one or both of the photographs is an accident of the angle of photography (other details show that neither of the photographic negatives has been accidentally reversed). Even if the displacement does exist, it may result from the misplacement of the slab after restoration (see below).

One also has to question the placement of the Emperor's couch in the middle of the floor, looking east, unless he were dining more or less alone. If there were a large number of other couches some would have to be placed behind him (whereas, as suggested above, if he were placed at the south end, all the other couches would be placed in front of him). Moreover marking couch position on the floor with a large slab of costly marble in this way inverts the usual way of marking couch spaces on floors, where the area to be covered by the couch (invisible) is decorated with less care and expense than the area around (visible).

The evidence relating to the slab is in fact rather more complex than Bek suggests. Chillman[39] actually reports and restores 5 such slabs, only one being extant. The other four were, he suggests, distributed radially round the central slab, each with one corner touching one of the corners of the central slab. Five impressive slabs of a costly

---

[36] Kähler 1950 125 and Bek 1980 198.
[37] Giubilei 1990 Fig.1.
[38] Bek 1980 Figs. 91 and 92.
[39] Chillman 1924 116. Paribeni 1922 236 only shows one.

marble may not mark one special spot but rather a conspicuous decoration for the room centre.[40]

The current slab has been removed at least once and maybe more than once.[41] Guidobaldi notes the observation of a restorer that there were cramp marks typical of wall facings on the slab, implying originally it came from a wall not the floor.[42] Large pavonazzetto pieces (0.88 x 0.52m) were used elsewhere on the floor, and it may be that these were mistaken for fragments of larger slabs. On the other hand, Chillman's recording is usually reliable and an aerial photograph[43] seems to suggest that there are blank spaces in the imprints of the opus sectile pattern of the floor at points corresponding to the positions shown by Chillman for the four surrounding slabs.

Finally, the slab could have marked not a dining position but maybe the position of a statuary group (one meant to be seen in the round?). If there were, however five slabs, it is harder to imagine a suitable group, and this suggestion, like the dining proposal, is open to the criticism that the slab(s) would be at least partially covered.

In summary, whether there was a central pavonazzetto slab, whether there were five such slabs, and whether they signify anything at all in terms of what or who was positioned where in the room, are all still very much open questions.

7.2.3 A multi-function building

Other aspects of the building design make the idea that as a whole it had uses beyond dining more attractive.[44] The seven room suite (Fig 46 20-27) with its prominent wall spaces for pictures, seems very likely to have been a display area for works of art, undistracted by external prospects and sophisticated waterworks, to be enjoyed all year round, judging from the heating arrangements. The fountain suite (Fig.46 1-19) was in

---

[40] Guidobaldi 1994 260 n.43 notes the use of a plain slab where an emblema might be placed as somewhat unusual.

[41] In Aurigemma's illustration (Fig.51, pre 1962) it appears to be missing. It was in place in 1964 (MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig.126). Giubilei 1990 says the central slab was missing while she was writing her article but subsequently replaced (n.16); De Franceschini 1991 TE5 says all the slabs are missing. Guidobaldi 1994 161 and 260 writes as if the single slab were in situ. It is in place today (June 2002).

[42] Guidobaldi 1994 260 n.43.

[43] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 Fig.126.

[44] This is the conclusion MacDonald and Pinto 1995 107 come to. Guidobaldi 1994 260 favours a 'museum' role for the whole complex.

one sense a vestibule to the seven-room suite, which was otherwise accessible only by side doors (and not, directly, from the Stadium Garden).

Whether the complex should be read, and read only, as a monumental atrium[45] is doubtful – whatever is intended by the term. The visitor to the Villa had probably already passed through one formal entrance – the Central Vestibule itself. The Arcaded Triclinium did not directly lead to or introduce any other major parts of the Villa, apart from the seven-room suite. Apart from the connection to the seven-room suite, its own points of entry and exit were discreet and indirect. Once in the central room the only obvious way[46] out was east to the seven-room suite. The north was visually blocked by the large fountain, south was the most solid wall of the room, and west led, indirectly but visibly, back to the open air. Any distributive or 'cross-roads' function was not therefore highlighted by the architecture.

The Arcaded Triclinium has also been represented as a 'hinge' between the orientations of the East West Terrace and the Stadium Garden but in fact it did not lead in any obvious way to, or from, either of them, rather, it occupied a space which happened to exist between them, and also reconciled some ground level-differences between them (see catalogue entry).[47] Apart from the view out to the east, the Arcaded Triclinium is a self-contained complex. The central room, with its strong north south axis could, it seems to me, be set up for occupation of various kinds – dining, audience, entertainment – surrounded by a complex but discreetly murmuring set of waterworks in every direction – pools to the east and west, large block fountain to the north, small octagonal block fountains, glimpsed through windows, to the south. The arrangement of water features round a central covered room does recall the triclinium of the Domus Flavia with its island fountains either side and visible through windows, and the maze pool visible through the columnar screen at the end but here we have water on all four sides, and different water designs are used.

---

[45] De Franceschini 1991 504 followed by Adriano 2000 233 uses the term 'atrio monumentale', without further explanation of what is meant. At 510 she again describes the Arcaded Triclinium as the monumental entrance to the Stadium Garden, but they were only linked by two discreet off-axis passages – in no sense did the Arcaded Triclinium introduce or play a subsidiary role to the Garden, it merely adjoined it.

[46] There were other ways out, but the viewer's eye was not led to them.

[47] Giubilei 1990 56 for the 'hinge'.

7.3 The Stadium Garden

7.3.1 Precedents and similar areas at the Villa

Pliny has left descriptions of two landscaped areas in his Tuscan villa (one gestatio in modum circi[48] and one hippodromus[49]) in the shape of a sporting arena.[50] Similar shapes are physically recognisable in some other dwellings. Unfortunately the Palatine Hippodrome (partly visible at Fig.132 28) has not been properly published and its detailed current appearance is the result of many later changes; structures at Castel Gandolfo and the Villa dei Quintili await full exploration and publication. The structure at Silin in Libya has not been excavated. There is a semi circular pool at each end and a rectangular pool towards the middle, but the use of gardens, paths and buildings in and around is not known, nor is the date.[51]

Pliny's hippodromus included an open-air dining room but also a building containing a bedroom and seating area. He enjoyed walking, sitting, dining, and sleeping there. The planed areas were very varied and included full size trees, lower shrubs like box and laurel, roses, lawn, fruit trees, acanthus and a 'natural' area. It is evident that within the constraints of the basic shape he felt free to insert a wide selection of different elements both natural and built. The gestatio was also planted and viewed as a garden but its name suggests that there was a surfaced path on which a more serious walking or riding circuit could be enjoyed.

Sometimes the surviving earlier gardens had features directly reminiscent of the original architecture beyond the shape – perhaps recalling the metae, or the central barrier (spina) of the circus.[52] Some of them contained water features, like the Palatine Hippodrome pools, but not in any prescribed form. In Pliny's hippodromus there were

---

[48] *Ep.* 5.6.17.
[49] *Ep* 5.6.32ff
[50] Reconstructions of Pliny's villa and these two areas in particular are legion and variable since the textual description is not exhaustive or definitive. Du Prey 1994 323f has a list of known restorations; Tanzer 1924 108f conveniently reproduces many of these.
[51] Salza Prina Ricotti 1970. I agree with Förtsch 1993 79 n.965 that most of the other examples cited by Gieré 1986 are very uncertain, (or too late for my purposes). For the reasons given at 4.3.3 I am also doubtful about the inclusion of Posillipo in this type by Gieré 1986 and Förtsch 1993. There are also large examples from Judaea (Humphrey 1986 530ff and 568ff).
[52] See above for Silin; the two semi-circular pools like metae at either end of the long axis of the Palatine Hippodrome appear to be part of the original Domitianic design.

fountains and pool(s) in the dining and bedroom areas and watercourses throughout (though these also had a practical use, for watering the garden areas). Most of the known structures prior to Hadrian were not large enough and/or too obstructed by plants and buildings to offer any scope for physical activity beyond walking or gentle riding (not racing) – they were gardens imitative of sporting forms, not arenas for sports.

So far it is clear that the concept of a stadium (or similar) shaped garden existed for the Romans, and that the area might be known by the name of the structure it resembled. Modern writers have concerned themselves with what particular gardens should properly be called among the choices on offer (stadium, circus, or hippodromus). Although it would be interesting to know whether owners saw their gardens as circuses rather than stadiums since it might reflect an attraction to one form of sport rather than another, with the exception of Pliny, we do not know exactly what they called them and I have used, for convenience, the generic term stadium garden, following MacDonald and Pinto's terminology for the Villa, and Hoffmann 1980.[53]

If Pliny found space and function for two such gardens in one villa, it is not surprising to find several areas which recall this hairpin shape at Hadrian's Villa.[54] These include the Park Grotto with its long approach valley (Fig.1 44); the Scenic Canal set in a deep narrow valley with its one curved end (Fig.80); the East West Terrace with its rounded ends and pool down the middle (Fig.31), and even Fountain Court feature 3 – a long thin pool with terminal features on the axis of a long thin garden (Fig.22).

However the area apparently most reminiscent of a racing or running track is the approach to the Central Vestibule (Fig.101) which recent excavation has shown[55] consisted of two long parallel stone surfaced roads joined by a short curved section at the gate end and a straight section at the Central Vestibule end. The excavators suggest the central area and the edges of the roads were planted. In this case the double track efficiently allowed carriages to approach the grand formal entrance up one side, and

---

[53] Förtsch 1993 78ff discusses the correct use of terminology with reference to the usage by Hoffmann 1980 and Gieré 1986. He objects particularly to Hoffmann's use of the term stadium.
[54] See Cat.2 exclusion 4 for the marble model of a stadium found at the Villa and the unproven suggestion that a real stadium might have been planned for the Villa.
[55] Not yet fully published: Filippi 2001 478-482. The resemblance has not been noted publicly by the excavators, who have been addressing the question of an Egyptian model or connection, and probably was not visible to Förtsch, Hoffmann, and Gieré. See Cat.1 exclusion 18.

depart down the other side, having dropped off their passengers.[56] Since there were buildings on the right hand side, and not the left, and these may have had some use for arriving visitors, it is arguable that they approached up the right hand side and empty vehicles and horses departed down the left (recalling the anticlockwise circuit of a true hippodrome or circus).[57] The paved surface of the ancient road does not appear suitable for actual racing.[58] The design was very practical but must surely also have recalled the sports arenas for those using it - almost certainly on horseback or in carriages. Its resemblance is clear not just on arrival but from the Villa terraces above (Fig.101.2). These preliminary thoughts are very much subject to full publication of the recent and ongoing excavations, especially of the structures at the side of the road.

Turning to the Stadium Garden itself, Hadrian's version is certainly the most built up and the least green of the known examples – the only areas which we know were planted here were beds alongside the canal, and parts of the cavea fountain. Hoffmann suggests that in earlier examples garden was more important than water, and the Stadium Garden reverses this, but as so few examples are properly known outside Pliny's letters, it is hard to be sure about this, and Pliny stresses that the noise of water can be heard throughout his hippodromus. Sometimes the impression is given that the extent of the buildings was accidental and an additive process.[59] It is clear that the complex took physical shape over some years but no one suggests this was a very long period of years.[60] Certainly there may have been changes or additions to original intentions, but the design of the two axes and particularly the way that the east west axis integrates with the Arcaded Triclinium and the lowest level of the Peristyle Pool Building strongly indicates that shape was known from the outset; whether the detail as originally conceived was simpler cannot now be ascertained. The stadium shape may not have been evident from every vantage point within the complex,[61] but the enclosure especially of the north and south sections within solid walls made the long thin shape evident to a person walking the Garden and it was very evident from higher viewing points such as the upper levels of the Peristyle Pool Building.

---

[56] Support vehicles and staff would not have had to use these roads since they could fork left at the gate to use the parallel lower road leading straight into service parts of the Villa.
[57] Humphrey 1986 5.
[58] Humphrey 1986 83 for the type of track surface desirable for circuses and similar structures.
[59] For example MacDonald and Pinto 1995 77'Thus in the end most of the Stadium floor was built over;' Farrar 1998 54 'now appears rather cluttered.'
[60] Hoffmann 1980 summarised by MacDonald and Pinto 1995 77.
[61] The same would, I think, be true from within Pliny's hippodromus, with its shady room(s) and planted thickets.

7.3.2 The central area

In Cat.1 H12 I have discussed my reasons for believing that the central area (Fig.55 15) was paved, probably with mosaic (rather than being a shallow pool, or a lawn), and in 9.4.2 the reasons for thinking that a large Niobid group was set up there. Salza Prina Ricotti, on the other hand, thinks that it was a location for performance, and this enters into her counter arguments to Hoffman's shallow pool idea.[62] The suggestion also knits with her ideas about tricliniar use of the whole Garden (see below) but on closer examination, the merits of the area as a stage are doubtful. If we assume for the moment that there were couches set up in the areas numbered 2 and/or 12/13 and/or 17 on Fig.55, as well as in the ground floor of the Peristyle Pool Building[63] it is immediately apparent that whatever was going on in the central area would scarcely be visible to most of them, whether because of the orientation of dining couches, the narrowness of the view onto the court, the distance, and/or the screens of columns. Of course guests could have moved into the court for the entertainment (but they could have moved anywhere for entertainment). Only the rooms on the lower floor of the Peristyle Pool Building did have a good view down onto the court (Fig.61.2, the court is the foreground area with grass and rubble). Therefore the court though potentially usable as a kind of stage, was far from 'l'ideale per organizzare questi spettacoli',[64] particularly for the large numbers of people whom the author envisages being invited, sometimes, to banquets in the area.[65] It is at least as probable that its prime function was as an open area for the display of statuary, as I have suggested.

7.3.3 Dining areas and other uses

This brings us to a more detailed look at the use of the Stadium Garden. We know that Pliny had dining areas which looked onto his gestatio in modum circi and a dining area within his hippodromus and it is natural to look and see if there are similar locations here. I think it is very probable that the rooms on the lower floor of the Peristyle Pool Building shown on Fig.55 and the suite at the north end (1-3 on Fig.55) principally

---

[62] Her previous arguments are restated at Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 355f. She does not deal anywhere with the question of the location of the Niobid group.
[63] The court was visible only from the windows of the seven-room Arcaded Triclinium suite, not from a reclining position within.
[64] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 357.
[65] 250 or 330 people according to Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 223 (no distribution plan is given).

7.3.2 The central area

In Cat.1 H12 I have discussed my reasons for believing that the central area (Fig.55 15) was paved, probably with mosaic (rather than being a shallow pool, or a lawn), and in 9.4.2 the reasons for thinking that a large Niobid group was set up there. Salza Prina Ricotti, on the other hand, thinks that it was a location for performance, and this enters into her counter arguments to Hoffman's shallow pool idea.[62] The suggestion also knits with her ideas about tricliniar use of the whole Garden (see below) but on closer examination, the merits of the area as a stage are doubtful. If we assume for the moment that there were couches set up in the areas numbered 2 and/or 12/13 and/or 17 on Fig.55, as well as in the ground floor of the Peristyle Pool Building[63] it is immediately apparent that whatever was going on in the central area would scarcely be visible to most of them, whether because of the orientation of dining couches, the narrowness of the view onto the court, the distance, and/or the screens of columns. Of course guests could have moved into the court for the entertainment (but they could have moved anywhere for entertainment). Only the rooms on the lower floor of the Peristyle Pool Building did have a good view down onto the court (Fig.61.2, the court is the foreground area with grass and rubble). Therefore the court though potentially usable as a kind of stage, was far from 'l'ideale per organizzare questi spettacoli',[64] particularly for the large numbers of people whom the author envisages being invited, sometimes, to banquets in the area.[65] It is at least as probable that its prime function was as an open area for the display of statuary, as I have suggested.

7.3.3 Dining areas and other uses

This brings us to a more detailed look at the use of the Stadium Garden. We know that Pliny had dining areas which looked onto his gestatio in modum circi and a dining area within his hippodromus and it is natural to look and see if there are similar locations here. I think it is very probable that the rooms on the lower floor of the Peristyle Pool Building shown on Fig.55 and the suite at the north end (1-3 on Fig.55) principally

---

[62] Her previous arguments are restated at Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 355f. She does not deal anywhere with the question of the location of the Niobid group.
[63] The court was visible only from the windows of the seven-room Arcaded Triclinium suite, not from a reclining position within.
[64] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 357.
[65] 250 or 330 people according to Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 223 (no distribution plan is given).

fulfilled this function. The side rooms in these areas may have been used for rest rather than additional dining space. These suites commanded the best and quite different views - the first down the whole length of the Garden (Fig.56.2), and the second down to the court and out through the whole width of the Arcaded Triclinium (Fig.61.2).

In other parts of the Villa, major dining areas are generously provided with latrines.[66] Here the provision is less generous, but we are looking at much smaller dining rooms. Fig.55 7, adjacent to the north suite, is a latrine. In the corridor behind the Peristyle Pool Building suite is a (currently inaccessible) recess which was also possibly a latrine.[67]

Whether areas Fig.55 12/13 and 17 (the north and south halls) were also principally used for dining is more dubious and in particular I do not think they were utilised as suggested by Salza Prina Ricotti for increasing the numbers who could be entertained at large banquets since, as discussed under the Arcaded Triclinium, such fragmented dining areas severely limited those who had any chance of seeing their host.[68] She assumes that the emperor would want to entertain large numbers of people at the Villa (an assumption which is explored in more detail at 10.1.3) but not in a 'drill field'. She also recognises that being able to see the Emperor would be important. She regards the problem as solved by the creation of a series of smaller linked spaces. In reality, most of these would not in fact have a view of the Emperor except if he walked past them. Nonetheless the north and south halls might occasionally have been set up for dining, providing yet more choice of location for smaller groups. Otherwise they were light and airy structures – especially the north hall with its central pool, very probable large roof opening, and fountains visible through windows (as reconstructed by Hoffmann 1980). They could be adopted for various uses, especially in the summer months. The south hall had a particularly fine close up view of the full width of the cavea fountain. The north hall contained eight statue pedestals and a large pool,

---

[66] 6 in the Water Court main building, 3 in the Scenic Triclinium.
[67] De Franceschini 1991 PE11.
[68] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 174ff, inter alia. Notwithstanding his identification of the north and south halls as oeci cyziceni, Hoffmann 1980 68 is doubtful about triclinia use and sees them as providing space for indoor exercise in the tradition of ambulationes with shade provided by structures rather than plantings. Förtsch 1993 is unconvinced by the pure ambulationes concept though he does not explicitly favour dining.

suggesting this atrium-like arrangement may have been the location for a portrait gallery.

However exactly they were used, the various elements of the stadium shape here showed the variation and segmentation of design which is found in Pliny's gardens, represented here by different water features and buildings, rather than plantings.

7.4 The Water Court

7.4.1 Use

Despite the nomenclature, there is more garden at the Water Court than the Stadium Garden. The large peristyle garden is very prominent, with a double walkway all round, and the combination of enclosed garden space with attached suites is a longstanding tradition finding many uses in public and private areas. Recent work at the Flavian Templum Pacis in Rome has for example established not just, as already known, that the complex was square in shape with a main wing of rooms on one side only, but that in the central area, surrounded by a colonnade, were 6 long thin pools and plantings.[69] It is easy to find broad precedents in large dwellings too – at the Villa itself the Republican design included a large open area with rooms on some sides,[70] or one might compare three square peristyle gardens with colonnades and flanking rooms on the Palatine.[71] It follows that it is dangerous to rely on one comparison rather than another as evidence for function, as De Franceschini has with her suggestion that the Water Court was used as a library.[72] She rightly draws attention to the failure so far to identify a major library space at the Villa, but she has not identified any signs of suitable storage fittings inside the Water Court buildings, in areas which would be out of the open air, and away from the damaging potential of the water features. Given the seemingly insatiable desire for choice of dining location, the fact that there were other dining areas at the Villa does not, as she suggests, prove that dining was not the prime function of the Water Court.

---

[69] La Rocca 2001 195ff, Rizzo 2001238ff. The on-site exhibition at the Villa August 2000 referenced the Foro di Porta Marina at Ostia and the Traianeum at Italica as comparisons

[70] The Residence Quadrangle, Lugli 1927 passim.

[71] Fig.132 10 and 19; Fig .133 7.

[72] De Franceschini 1991 470ff builds a parallel with the design of the Library of Hadrian at Athens and the Templum Pacis, both of which are certainly known to have contained libraries. Her idea has been roundly criticised by Guidobaldi 1994 259, Salza Prina Ricotti 1998 370 n.18, and MacDonald and Pinto 1995 notes to 95.

There is circumstantial evidence that the Water Court was used for dining.[73] Though there are no built couches[74] there are 6 latrines in the main building.[75] This part of the Villa has its own entrance from the road.[76] This would help with security and management of any outside guests, so they did not have to cross the width of the Villa (from the major entrance at the Central Vestibule) to reach the dining area.

Where couches were set up, and for how many people, and how entertainment could be shown to them, are more difficult questions to answer with certainty from the architecture. A segmentally curved couch, looking out into the room, fits well in line with the rear fountain wall (Fig. 68 23) and would provide space for maybe a dozen people with the view out of the building and down the garden directly ahead and plenty of space in front to stage entertainment.

The shape of the main room space (Fig.68 20) actually makes it quite difficult to fit further couches in here harmoniously with the architecture. The columnar screens undulate in and out. Curved couches placed in front of or behind the corner fountain screens (Fig. 68 21,22, 24, 25) which repeated their curvature, would place the diners facing into the corners. Couches curved the other way relate oddly to the columnar screen.[77] Curved couches could be placed at the three other openings (to Fig.68 17, 28 and 7) looking into the room but one would then block the main entrance and the view through, and the other two would have their backs to the side suites.[78] Traditional couch arrangements do fit nicely into the three rectangular rooms looking into each side pool (Fig.68 26, 29, 30 and 15, 16, 19).

If we assume the Emperor was entertaining a siginificant number of people using some or all of these arrangements, and that he took the prime position at the back of the room looking out down the long view, however, he was certainly not visible from the

---

[73] Most modern writers agree that dining was a function, including Stierlin 1984 165, who nonetheless goes on to conclude that this was the Villa location where Hadrian in his role as the new Dionysus received the adoration of his subjects.
[74] Cat.1 H14 n.8 for the suggestion that there were raised areas for the placement of couches in front of the corner fountains.
[75] One by Fig. 68 22 and 24; two each by 21 and 25.
[76] Fig.78 for the nearby junction with the underground road running down the east side of the Villa.
[77] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 Fig. 30 puts couches in this position.
[78] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 Fig. 30 suggests various couch positions. Position 'a' ignores the presence there of the central pool.

side rooms and might not be visible from other couches in the main room.[79] I have discussed above the need for the Emperor to be visible when hosting large dinner parties. Setting up the main suite for dining for a large number was thus not absolutely straightforward, especially if after dinner entertainment was to be provided and visible in situ.

Whether rows of couches were set up, in the usual U formation, outside, in the rear part of the porticoes, instead of or as well as in the main building, possibly enlarging the dining capacity greatly, are more open questions.[80] There are issues with this too – the prime position would presumably be at the south end, looking down the canal, but again the occupants would be hidden from most other guests. It is even possible that dining took place outside, with entertainment and seats set up inside the main building but the main building was not ideally designed for entertainment either, with many rooms not having a view into the main room at all, other views obstructed by screen of columns, and a pool in the middle of the main area.

The very large garden area, with sheltered porticoes, suggests that the Water Court would also have been used outside dining periods for walking and relaxation.

7.4.2 The octagonal fountain room and its precedents

The central room of the Water Court main suite has eight 'sides' and numerous distinct water features – the rear fountain wall (Fig.74), four corner fountains (Fig.73) and the central pool. Apart from this room (and excluding the baths) there are only three eight-sided rooms known at the Villa. The first is the Water Court's own vestibule (Fig.68 2), with pools under the windows; the second the West Belvedere (Fig.1 37, no water)[81] and the third the Reverse Curve Pavilion (Cat.1 H21, Fig.1 43), probably containing some form of water feature. There are no round rooms except the mysterious Park Rotunda (Fig.1 36)[82] and the Circular Hall in the Southern Range

---

[79] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 Fig. 30 shows clearly that the other couch positions are mostly invisible to and distant from each other.
[80] Much of the commentary by Salza Prina Ricotti is highly speculative and not always consistent. For example, according to Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 180 'the emperor reclined here like a normal host among his friends') whereas at Salza Prina Ricotti 1994a 97 Hadrian entertained kings and heads of state in the main building and their entourages outside. She postulates a total dining capacity of 370 (Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 265) without giving further details.
[81] See Cat.1 exclusions 19.
[82] Discussed at 2.4.

(Fig.1 45). The relatively small number of round and octagonal rooms is consistent with the complexity (and hence costly) nature of such rooms which involved unusual roof structures and possibly the creation of odd (challenging) shaped spaces around.

Although the Water Court vestibule is, as its name suggests, the point of entry to the complex, the other two octagonal rooms at the Villa are different. The West Belvedere is an isolated structure (400m, for example, from the nearest structure to the south) – substantially built but nonetheless essentially a pavilion or viewing structure, a staging point in a journey around the Villa's extensive and no doubt landscaped grounds. It may also have functioned as an observatory.[83] I find it unlikely that it functioned as the point of arrival for the Southern Range,[84] understood as essentially a separate villa, but 400m distant from it.

The Reverse Curve Pavilion is also situated at the extreme edge of the Southern buildings, overlooking the West Terrace. The function of the Reverse Curve Pavilion has been identified as: belvedere; Gartensaal; atrio mistilineo; ingresso monumentale; 'per le dispute de Platonici, o Accademici'; lieu de culte; part of the lodgings for a 'moglie morosa'.[85] The central part was open (or perhaps covered with awnings). Again it would fulfil the role of a garden pavilion or viewing point admirably.

However all four octagonal rooms including the Water Court main room look out onto landscaped areas or are viewing points. There is a strong connection with gardens, with garden pavilions, and three of the four incorporate water in their design.

There is some previous connection but not, on close examination, a very strong one, between water features and octagonal or round structures. Neuerburg struggles to find secure, datable, examples of round or octagonal fountain rooms in residential decorative contexts, though there are undoubtedly baths parallels, not discussed here.[86] Letzner 1999's Type 4 appears at first glance to considerably expand Neuerburg's list, but if structures outside Italy, or later than the 2nd century are excluded, a very small

---

[83] Giuliani 1988.
[84] Filippi 2001 482.
[85] Respectively MacDonald and Pinto 1995 94; Kähler 1950 81-84, 129-132; De Franceschini 1991 584; Coarelli 1982 71; Piranesi; Stierlin 1984 174; Salza Prina Ricotti 1982 36 but vestibolo 2001 277.
[86] Neuerburg 1965 65ff 'Ninfei rotondi', in which he includes octagonal forms. I believe the example he cites in the Villa Massimo-Negroni (Cat.153) is part of a bath suite.

number are left, and for most of these there is actually no evidence of water, or a suggestion that they were associated with baths.

Generally octagonal room forms appear in the first century AD and are increasingly skilfully managed.[87] The Octagon at the Domus Aurea has no water in the room itself, nor does the structure under the Temple of Venus and Rome (5.2.4). There are possible examples of octagonal rooms with water on the Palatine. Two small, double height octagonal rooms on the upper level of the Domus Augustana (Fig.132, left and right of rooms 24 and 25) were piped for water. Although they are usually treated as fountain rooms,[88] they are curiously small (the floor area is only about 3m across) and allow very little room for sitting or reclining.[89] On the same level in the Domus Flavia there is another larger octagonal room (Fig.132 8) which may have had water in the structures to each side, though this is doubtful, and there was no water in the octagonal room itself which functioned as entrance to this part of the Palatine complex.[90] There is no water in two octagonal rooms on the lower floor of the Domus Augustana (Fig.133 3 and 5) which looked out onto a peristyle garden, but not down its main axis. In the Horti Sallustiani Hadrianic octagonal room, where strong parallels have been drawn with the Villa rooms, there is no water in the room itself, only two floor pools in subsidiary rooms which do not intersect directly with it.[91]

One of these rooms then, without water, is transitional in function, like the Water Court vestibule. Most looked out to gardens or viewpoints and the open air. The isolation which characterises the West Belvedere and Reverse Curve Pavilion does not occur in Rome - the Palatine was of course already tight on space when Domitian began building. However one suspects that a better understanding of many large villas (and their surrounding original landscapes) outside the city would produce more

---

[87] The asymmetry and block-like spokes of the Octagon in the Domus Aurea compared with the Domus Flavia and Augustana examples subsequently listed here. Kähler 1950 87ff deals generally with the appearance of round and octagonal forms prior to Hadrian.
[88] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.177 and Letzner 1999 Cat.213 (note however Letzner's plan 81.1 is not in fact of this structure but of an octagonal room on the lower floor).
[89] LTUR II 43 refers to a little octagonal latrine. The exact location is not clear from the text but I cannot identify any other location in the area which fits the description so it appears that the author believes the room to be a latrine. Neudecker 1994 in his survey of latrines including the Palatine does not reference, nor are round or octagonal latrines at all common.
[90] See discussion at 5 n.106.
[91] Lehmann-Hartleben and Lindros 1935, passim.

examples of isolated octagonal pavilions.[92] Many would of course have been built less sturdily than those at the Villa.

Water within these octagonal designs was an option, and far from a probability. This background does not in any way prepare us for the copious use of water designs around the octagonal room of the Water Court: a pool beneath the oculus, two side pools, the rear fountain wall, and the four corner fountains.[93] On top of all this water was used outside in the garden and in the entrance vestibule. In one sense the Water Court looks back to those earlier, smaller, fountain dining rooms where water was also very prominent but used in entirely different ways – in single rear cascades, pools and canals around and between the couches, and maybe in a pool seen beyond in the garden.[94] However the shape of the room combined with the imaginative employment of water elements, different to those used previously, and different to each other, seems to be entirely Hadrian's, or his architect's, design.

7.5 The Scenic Triclinium and Canal

7.5.1 Egyptian links and religious status

The Scenic Triclinium and Canal is the only one of the large complexes to have been linked with the list of names given by the *SHA* for parts of Hadrian's Villa.[95] The Canal, or rather the whole valley, was given the name Canopus in the 16th century or earlier.[96] The term Serapaeum, referring more specifically to the Triclinium, came into use much later and derives not from the *SHA* but from a passage in Strabo which describes the temple of Serapis at Canopus, near Alexandria.[97] There have been finds of Egyptianising sculpture in the general area, but as Cat.2 C11 and 9.4 explains, I do not believe there was a significant Egyptian theme to the decoration of the complex.

MacDonald and Pinto's assessment of whether this part of the Villa was named by Hadrian either Canopus or Serapaeum,[98] with which I broadly agree, may be briefly

---

[92] The pre-Hadrianic structure shown on Fig.22 looks like one of rounded form.
[93] Discussed respectively at 5.2.4, 5.2.4, 4.4.4 and 6.3.2.
[94] Such rooms from Pompeii, from Minori, from Baiae, have been extensively discussed at 4.2.
[95] See 2.2.
[96] Ligorio *Descrittione* as cited by Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 256.
[97] Strabo 17.1.7.
[98] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 108ff.

summarised as follows. Nothing material is known of the architecture of Canopus town except that a canal linked it to Alexandria and there was a temple to Serapis. Egyptian and Roman temples to Serapis do not normally take the form of the Triclinium. The attribution of the name Serapaeum to a semi-circular structure in the Campus Martius is not definite. The nearest structural comparisons to the Triclinium are Roman, non-religious, building forms (more on these comparisons below). They wonder whether the name Canopus, which was out of keeping with the other names listed by the *SHA*, was in fact a Hadrianic name, or crept into the tradition later. Finally, since we do not know whether the name referred to a structural similarity, to a religious significance, or to the use of a place for the forms of relaxation for which Canopus was notorious, we cannot link the name for certain to any place in the Villa, and it may have referred to somewhere other than the Scenic Triclinium and Canal. There are for example pools like canals in other parts of the Villa, as discussed at 5.1.

The existence of latrines and a stibadium militate against the structure being conceived as a shrine of any sort as has been suggested, (and certainly not a shrine to Antinous who did not die until it was complete or substantially so).[99] The architectural context of the complex (see below) argues circumstantially that the place was essentially used for entertainment and relaxation, but proves nothing about what it was called.

In summary the term Canopus has inexplicable significance, and Serapaeum is not used by the ancient source. Since there is no evidence which securely links either of these terms to this part of the Villa, they are potentially misleading and best avoided.

7.5.2 Dining and entertainment function

The Scenic Triclinium and Canal stand detached from other structures (Fig.1 38) and the built up core of the Villa, yet close to the grand Villa entrance at the Central Vestibule (Fig.1 12),[100] and two sets of baths (Fig.1 30 and 33). There is what appears

---

[99] A specific suggestion that the grave or at least a monument or shrine to Antinous was located here has not been proved by excavation and has generally been criticised (see for example Jashemski 1992 580ff). The unsatisfactory reconstruction by Grenier 1989 of an Egyptian cult setting involving Antinous is discussed at 9.4.3.

[100] Whose final form was determined in the middle period of building at the Villa, not from the outset (Filippi 2001 478ff).

to be an accommodation block alongside (Fig.1 35).[101] These features suggest very much that it was intended as a location for the dining and entertainment of overnight visitors, and the most clearly purpose built location for this role at the Villa. Visitors had everything they needed at hand.

The other areas which have been identified as major dining centres do not have all these features. The Arcaded Triclinium and the Stadium Garden do not appear to have any accommodation nearby; access to them is discreet and not monumental. They do have baths nearby. The Water Court has its own access, but no baths; there is some potential for a little accommodation in the poorly understood structures outside its walls to the east.

Dinner visitors to the Scenic Triclinium and Canal probably did not need, and were not given access to, or transit through, either the business parts of the Villa, or the Emperor's private quarters. The various buildings of the Central Vestibule are not fully understood[102] but it is clear that access to other parts of the Villa could be controlled – and prevented - from the large eastern room, with an opus sectile floor. The visitor taken south out of this room was faced immediately with the axial view up the Canal valley to the Triclinium (Fig.83.1). The area was not surrounded on all sides by walls and other buildings, like the other major complexes discussed, and though regularly laid out, has a more open feel. The fact that the left and right Canal banks are not laid out symmetrically (Fig.80) also tempered the formality of the setting.

The existence of the stibadium provides the clearest possible evidence that the Triclinium was used for dining, but by any standards this was a profligate amount of building to achieve a relative small dining capacity, which I have calculated as follows. The stibadium itself (Fig.80 2) could take 18 people.[103] The dining platform would best fit a standard arrangement for 9 (Fig.80 1).[104] I am doubtful about the proposal that a further stibadium fitted the area between the canal in front of the

---

[101] The Canal Block (MacDonald and Pinto 1995 63). MacDonald notes a latrine at either end of the building, De Franceschini 1991 only one (SC1). Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 83 says two rooms with 28 places total. I have not unfortunately inspected the evidence.

[102] It seems likely that the rooms to the south or west of the entrance courtyard had some religious role; the rooms around the courtyard to its east look like offices for the guards controlling this major distributive point. Somewhere (the south extension?) must have been an area where Hadrian could formally receive visitors on arrival.

[103] According to the calculations of Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 246.

[104] Though Salza Prina Ricotti does not take it as a dining platform in her later writings, I take the view that it was (see 9.4.3).

masonry stibadium and the semi-circular pool but let us say that took another 9.[105] In the side pavilions jutting out from the front and adjoining the rectangular pool, two couches in L formation are proposed for each;[106] these could take more than 3 people each so let us say a further 10 each side. That gives a total of 50-60 people. The Canal Block would take about 40 people in single occupation (each room is assumed to have been divided into 2 floors). Thus everyone in the covered dining area could have overnight accommodation close by, assuming Hadrian and his immediate circle had more permanent accommodation elsewhere in the Villa. Even if the Block slept three per room, a maximum of 150 diners could be accommodated there.

Most of the floor space in the Triclinium is actually unusable, or unsuitable for dining even though the building had a total floor area of about 1100m^2. By contrast, the Water Court main wing occupies about 1300m^2, but most of it is regular-shaped, usable space. At the Scenic Triclinium, in the semi-circular area and rear extension, substantial areas are either pools or fountain wall. There are some side rooms which would be suitable for retiring between courses or after dinner. The rooms on the east side of the main building (Fig.81 12, 13, 16 and 17) are dark and mostly windowless, offering no pleasant prospect. They also contain one, or maybe 2 latrines, not discreetly hidden,[107] and the point of access to the dining platform. The long irregular shaped room on the west side (Fig.87.2 and 3), has an opus sectile floor, walls, and a painted ceiling. It was lighter but again had no view to the outside world.[108] Then there are a couple of small rooms in the side pavilions, but corridors and stairways here occupy as much space as usable rooms.

In designing the Triclinium itself, it is as if all practical planning and the idea of optimising useful space have been cast aside in favour of the creation of a real

---

[105] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 177. She says there is enough space to fit a couch, and for servants to pass behind to serve the main stibadium. There is about 2m. But where were the second stibadium guests served from? Either they were served from behind (likely?) or a second passage for servants, in front of the second stibadium, also had to be squeezed into the space. We know that Pliny served food floating on the water (in this case it would be the semi circular pool) but even he only used it for 'lighter' dishes (*Ep.*5.6.37). Alternatively food would have to be laid out on the edge of the pool for the inner stibadium guests beforehand. This is all rather clumsy and suggests the 2m walkway was never intended for anything more than serving to the main stibadium.

[106] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 177.

[107] This suite of rooms does have opus sectile floors, where preserved, and signs of marble wall facings (Guidobaldi 1994 CA 1,4,5,8 is more accurate that De Franceschini 1991). Fig.81 14 is definitely a latrine; it is not clear what 15 is. There was also one latrine in each side pavilion.

[108] The suggestions by De Franceschini 1991 that the room (CA11) was a kitchen seems unlikely given its floor (which she has not noted).

showpiece dining area for 50-60 people only – stunning from the outside, and with dramatic views to the outside from the key positions inside (Figs. 83.1, 85.2 and 3). There is nothing about the design which suggests the architect had other uses in mind too. By contrast at the Arcaded Triclinium, the central room is ambiguous as to function and the seven-room suite strongly suggests some kind of art gallery; at the Stadium Garden the north and south halls are again ambiguous as to function. At the Water Court there is more economical and practical use of space and outside a garden with permanent sheltered colonnades for strolling in all day, unlike the lopsided shade provided along the Canal.

There are some possible indications that dining extended to the banks of the Canal too. Food debris has been found in the planted beds, though servants carrying it away from the Triclinium (rather than diners) could have thrown it there.[109] Shade appears to have been provided on the east bank only, since this side, not the other, would still have been in sun at the dining hour.[110] Again, this might have been provided to cover people walking to the Triclinium rather than dining on the banks. There is no reason to assume that the Emperor would have wanted to entertain 400 or even as many as 1200 people here,[111] with all the security issues that would involve (and completely inadequate latrine and accommodation arrangements for such larger numbers)

For the first time in this Chapter we can identify a dining position for the Emperor – especially on the platform but also the stibadium – from which he would be distantly visible to most of his guests, including any on the banks, though not those in the side pavilions. As regards entertainment, a small number of people dining in the main part of the Triclinium might have seen entertainment performed immediately in front of them on what was essentially the passageway across the front of the building, but this would not have been visible to occupiers of the pavilions. The only scope for entertaining larger numbers was by using the Canal itself – water displays and ballets were feasible.[112] Such flamboyant displays would have been perfectly consistent with what we have seen so far of the atmosphere generated by the showpiece design, setting

---

[109] Jashemski 1987 159 reports finds of similar type from both east and west banks, consistent with Pompeian garden food debris. Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 255 n.531 gives more details of the foodstuffs found, which seem unlikely to have been fertiliser material, as the previous excavators suggested.
[110] Salza Prina Ricotti 1987 177.
[111] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 249 estimates 420 for the Triclinium including banks, rising to 1200 if the space as far north of the Vestibule were occupied – no further details of how the figures were arrived at is given. For dining in large numbers generally see 10.1.3.
[112] See 5.1.6.

and structures (though not among the list of entertainments favoured by Hadrian for his guests according to the *SHA*).

In summary, I believe that the Scenic Triclinium and Canal were the premier dining area for larger numbers of guests, and the only area where they could conveniently be accommodated close by overnight. Even so, the ideal number of guests was about 50, maybe extended at times by using the banks of the Canal

7.5.3 Precedents and comparisons

The Scenic Triclinium and Canal do not, as an ensemble, fit into tidy fountain, or building, typologies;[113] like their decorative programme, they are varied and allusive. So far as the waterworks are concerned, they use a combination of features usually seen separately:

- the large deep outside pool, usually set freestanding in a garden area, here continuing via a sub pool into the shadow of the building (5.1.8)and Fig.83)
- the covered, curved fountain wall (4.4.5 and Fig.88)
- water steps, both as multiple separate flights and as a wide single run (6.2.4 and Fig.88)
- the rectangular rear extension pool with its rear and side niches and barrel vaulted roof recalls earlier fountain rooms in some ways but it is full of water and only partly roofed, giving it completely different lighting. The platform which makes it capable of occupation is a novelty (Fig.85.1)

The building forms do resemble shapes seen elsewhere at the Villa and outside, but writ larger and more extravagantly. MacDonald and Pinto 1995[114] identified in particular the water structure on the Palatine Domus Augustana, north of the Hippodrome, but at the upper level which has a curved niched wall and a rear extension,[115] and the Fountain stibadium (Cat.1 H8 and Fig.43). The latter is an interesting comparison; since it is the Scenic Triclinium without the trappings - no rear

---

[113] As discussed in 4.1.5 and 9.3 and 9.4, I find neither architecture nor decoration strongly linked with the grotto.
[114] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 110.
[115] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.179. The building is in a poor state and it is not clear exactly how the waterworks functioned.

extension, no canal in the area in front (so far as we know – there has been no full excavation of the area yet), no side buildings, and very little wasted space despite its shape. Yet the stibadium is not much smaller (10m diameter compared to 12m) so would still have hosted a reasonable dinner party, in a different part of the Villa.

There are other buildings at the Villa similar to the Scenic Triclinium, and since there are built stibadia at both the Scenic Triclinium and the Fountain stibadium, I suggest they are spaces where stibadium furniture might be installed. First, the Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H18 and Fig.91). Andreae's work, though it has succeeded in establishing that this was not in all respects a miniaturised version of the Scenic Triclinium,[116] has not removed fundamental similarities – the combination of covered curved niched wall and rear extension, probably with water, the side rooms with latrines strongly suggesting a dining function. A stibadium fitted here would have been roughly 10m across compared to the Scenic Triclinium 12m.

Second, the Water feature adjoining the Water Court (Cat.1 H15 and Figs.75 and 76.1). This is a seven-niche structure 12m across closed by a screen of columns which could have contained a stibadium much the same size as the Scenic Triclinium. It did not have a rear extension, it did have side rooms, latrines (shown on Fig.75 as two semicircular rooms adjoining the back of the wall of Q), and a view out over water to Tivoli and the hills (Fig.76.2). it would be an intimate dining environment since diners could look out but essentially there was no view in. Finally, the vestibule facing the cavea fountain (Cat.1 R5 and Fig.13 H). Although this was not itself a water feature, there is strong circumstantial evidence for thinking that the semi-domed building provided with latrines would have housed yet another stibadium, again of a good size, this time facing the prospect of a cavea fountain.[117] For further discussion of stibadium dining see 10.1.3 and 4.

Overall, the design of the Scenic Triclinium and Canal takes existing water motifs and building designs, combines them with each other and produces a setting which is not just another dining area in a Villa apparently well supplied with interesting locations in which to dine, but arguably the most splendid of them, with a unique open air atmosphere and context. Its sculptural decoration, partly known, and discussed at

---

[116] Andreae and Ortega 1989 97ff. In particular, the front wall was closed.
[117] 4.3.4.

9.4.3-5, and especially the large Scylla group installed in the Canal, can only have added to the dramatic impression.

Conclusions

This Chapter began with suggesting similarities between the large complex features and concludes with thoughts on their differences. The Island Enclosure, Arcaded Triclinium and, ironically, the Stadium Garden, use garden to some extent in their design but green space is far more dominant in the central planting beds of the Water Court and the side areas framing the Scenic Canal. Insofar as a powerful Roman could be said to have private space, the Island Enclosure is at one end of the spectrum, and the Scenic Triclinium and Canal the other. The Island clearly offered the opportunity for withdrawal more or less alone, or socialising with a very small group. The Scenic Triclinium and Canal on the other hand appear purpose built for the important ritual of dining in a large group, though not necessarily as large a group as sometimes envisaged. The Arcaded Triclinium, Stadium Garden and Water Court are more flexible and diverse in functional possibility. There are dining possibilities in all of the complexes them and the role which dining, and dining with water around, played in the Villa will be discussed in more detail at Chapter 10. Some of the large complex features draw more clearly than others on recognisable preceding designs – the Stadium Garden and the square peristyle layout of the Water Court – but none of them are close replicas of any models we can identify today and all of them draw together new combinations and juxtapositions of a very wide range of different water features.

The next two Chapters discusses the way that the surface decoration of these features, and the others, contributed to their appearance and overall impact, beginning with surface decoration, point of water exit decoration, and the little explored use of water containers.

8. The decoration of water features at the Villa: surface, point of exit and water containers

Introduction

This Chapter moves on from the structure of the water features at the Villa to their decoration, which is considered and compared with the evidence for decoration prior to Hadrian. Although it would be logical to follow the order of discussion used with the architectural water features, the distribution of material from the Villa and the structure of previous research (or lack of it) would make this repetitive and instead I have chosen to break down the components of decoration into

- surface decoration – the materials which were applied to the surfaces of the water feature
- point of exit decoration – how the point(s) from which water emerged into the feature might be elaborated
- water containers – freestanding containers holding water or from which water flowed

which are dealt with together in 8, and

- fountain figures and sculpture found with water features

which are dealt with in Chapter 9.

8.1 Surface decoration

8.1.1 Precedents

Sometimes water basins set into or raised up from the ground, might be carved from stone with no finishing materials at all apparently applied.[1] More often the basin element of a water feature was lined with waterproof material (opus signinum) and finished internally and externally with plaster. Internal plaster was usually painted

[1] For example Eschebach 1982 on the Pompeii public fountains; Jashemski 1979-1993 II cites numerous examples of plain stone basins in or near gardens.

blue, sometimes with painted fish.[2] White marble facings were applied inside with increasing frequency in the first century AD. White marble was almost ubiquitous for other surfaces where water flowed, such as water steps.[3] Mosaic inside a pool or basin below water level was unusual.[4]

Above pool level there were several options by the first century AD. Where the feature was natural or carved from the rock, the rock surface might be left exposed partly or wholly.[5] Otherwise it could be plastered and painted, or encrusted with pieces of natural stone (pumice and other porous and spongy looking stone),[6] pebbles and shells. Mosaic of uncut glass, stone chips and cut glass tesserae might be set in the plaster. Stucco was used less extensively around water features (being less robust?).[7] Painted plaster and stucco used both geometric patterns and pictorial representations. Finally, flatter surfaces in and around the water feature might be faced with marble. Pilasters, cornices and other architectural mouldings framed and delineated some features. A water feature might use complex combinations of many decorative elements – as for example at the Casa del Torello where the three niche fountain wall had pilasters, architrave and pediments; painted decoration including imitation marble, nymphs with basins, and plants, and also mosaic using pumice, shells, marble, Egyptian blue, glass rods and discs, and broken and cut glass tesserae.[8] The decoration of the fountain room at the Domus Aurea included mosaic emblemata set in a pumice background covering the ceiling (Fig.138).

---

[2] Blue with fish – examples Pompeii VI 6 1/12 and VI 8 22/1 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cats.234 and 250).

[3] Though at the Casa di Diana block fountain from Ostia (mid second century) there is evidence of mosaic on steps (Marinucci 2001 236f).

[4] In the Pompeii mosaic fountains, for example, the mosaic normally began above the water level of the pool at the front. Farrar 1998 69 and 79 notes some mosaic-lined decorative pools outside Italy but mostly dated 3rd/4th century AD and from Ostia I am not aware of any earlier examples of mosaic below water level. The picture for impluvia is more complex – for example at the House of the Faun (Pompeii VI 12 2-5) there was a fine opus sectile floor while at the Casa del Tramezzo di Legno (Herculaneum III 3) a mosaic floor which matched the rest of the atrium was later covered by white marble (now broken away). Bathing pools in baths are excluded from this study.

[5] As at Sperlonga.

[6] In this thesis 'pumice' is used to mean pumice itself, and stone resembling pumice. The actual material used at the Villa is local stone of a similar appearance (light, porous and spongy) to true lava pumice (Neuerburg 1965 93).

[7] Stucco (plaster with relief decoration) was used extensively in bath building ceilings, but it is hard to pin it down in fountain room ceilings and in the apses of fountain niches, partly, one suspects, due to poor publication. It was used in the mosaic fountain at the House of the Ephebe (I 7 10/12, Neuerburg 1965 Cat.18).

[8] Pompeii V 1 7: Andersson 1990 221ff.

None of these decorative materials or characteristics was, by the end of the first century AD, exclusive to water features. There were, for example, columns covered in mosaic,[9] non-water bearing niches with pumice and mosaic,[10] and non-watery cave rooms with bare natural rock embellished with pumice, shell and mosaic figured panels.[11]

8.1.2 At the Villa

At the Villa, natural stone is left exposed in the fountain in the Republican cryptoporticus (Cat.1 R4, Fig. 12.2), the water display in the Large Baths cryptoporticus (Cat.1 H1, Fig.21.2), probably in the planting basins of the cavea fountain at the south end of the Stadium Garden (Cat.1 H12), and in the Park Grotto (Cat.1 H20, Fig.96.1).

R4 is very much a secondary feature in the Hadrianic Villa as discussed at 2.5. As a decorative feature H1 is, if anything, merely a fortuitous use of utilitarian channels (4.1.5). In the Stadium Garden the exposure of the reddish tufa in the open air probably produced an interesting colour contrast with plants growing in the basins.[12] The exposure of plain stone in the Park Grotto is limited to the rear fissure (Fig. 96.1) and perhaps the exposed sides of the approach valley (Fig.95.2). The outer parts of the grotto itself have been regularised, plastered and pumice applied (Fig.96.1-2) so that the overall appearance is not that of a natural cavern. The creation of a genuinely cave-like appearance was not a feature of Villa architecture (4.1.5) and this short list illustrates that natural stone was not a frequent characteristic of the water features of the Hadrianic Villa either.

Pumice is preserved in three pre-Hadrianic features;[13] and in five Hadrianic features. The fountain room in the East Belvedere (Cat.1 H3) was covered (so far as one can tell) internally and externally, walls and ceiling, with pumice (Figs.28.2-4, 29, 30.1-2).

---

[9] Museo Nazionale in Naples Inv. 9995-6, 10000-1 (from the House of the Mosaic Columns, Via dei Sepolcri, Pompeii).
[10] For example the House of Julia Felix garden wall where the decorated niches contained planting beds (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.143), or the House of Apollo non-water bearing walls (Sear 1977 Cat.27).
[11] For example at Anzio, decorated elements removed to the Museo Nazionale Romano (Palazzo Massimo 1998 242).
[12] Although as Fig.59 illustrates, plants could easily cover up the surface entirely.
[13] The Fountain room under the Doric Temple (Cat.1 R1, Fig.6.1 arrow); the nearby cistern fountain (R2, Fig.9.2); and the structure near the Water Court (R6, Fig.16.1).

There is pumice in the small room inserted into the basin at the south end of the Stadium Garden, and in the Park Grotto (Figs.60.3 and 96.2). The Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H17) also makes extensive use of pumice. It is the only surface decoration of the rear niche, probably the largest location for sculpture in the building (Fig.90). It also covers the surfaces of the four arched niches with water steps in the semicircular dining area (Fig.88.3-4). The fifth Hadrianic water feature in which pumice survives is the Upper Park Fountain Wall, where it is found in niches in the protruding buttresses and in the upper chamber.[14] The pumice applied in these large stretches in the Hadrianic features never appears to have been painted.

There are 16 other Hadrianic water features. Eight of these[15] do not contain any niches or rooms with water suitable for the application of pumice. In the other eight,[16] the décor is too badly decayed to tell whether pumice was used or not.

This evidence is too fragmentary to be conclusive but suggests that at the Villa there is still a strong link between pumice and the decoration of water features. Pumice was not limited to water features – it is found elsewhere in the Villa but always in niches or enclosed rooms (for example the blind arcades which run along the wall to the left of the fountain room under the Doric Temple, and also around the curved edge of that platform).[17] The quantity of pumice used at the Villa, and its prominent use at a major feature such as the Scenic Triclinium, comes as a surprise, since accounts of wall decoration tend to assume that by this stage pumice and cut stone and glass mosaic or marble facings had superseded other natural materials (see 3.4). Yet it is apparent at the Villa that pumice had a continuing decorative role of its own. On the other hand shells and marine deposits are not found, so far as we know, in any of the Hadrianic water features. It seems that it is the shells, pebbles and so on that have transmuted into mosaic, not the pumice. Although pumice is rarely noted in modern accounts of wall and ceiling decoration from the late first century onwards, this may be because the authors have focussed specifically on materials which give scope for pattern or

---

[14] Too overgrown for photography (May 2001).
[15] Cat.1 H2, H4, H6, H7, H10, H11, and H15 do not have surfaces or fountain structures suitable for the application of pumice. The features in the Large Baths cryptoporticus (H1) are stone cut.
[16] Cat. 1 H5, H8, H9, H 13, H16, H18, and H21. The Water Court (H14) does not appear to have had pumice but the upper parts of the rear fountain wall are badly decayed. De Franceschini 1991 467 says that according to Ligorio there was pumice 'nei ninfei' but she does not give a reference and I have not been able to find one in Ligorio Trattato.
[17] Neuerburg 1965 95 says that the (?) shrine at the top of the cavea of the North (Greek) Theatre was also pumiced.

figures, and pumice has been overlooked. Pumice is visible for example in the curves of arches in the Domus Augustana (Fig.139.2), dating perhaps 40 years earlier, and in the niches of the fountain wall from the house of Avidius Quietus, dating perhaps 50 years later.[18]

But in no sense at the Villa was pumice used to create anything that looked like a natural cave or grotto – though its presence as fake rock had those connotations.[19] It also, unlike complex mosaic, made a good neutral backdrop for the display of major works of art of an appropriate nature.

Detailed evidence for the use of wall and ceiling mosaic at the Villa is sadly lacking - all that remains anywhere are fragments and fallen tesserae; few patterns and no figures can be distinguished.[20] The few polychrome mosaics which have survived from the Villa all appear to have come from floors, not walls.[21] I am not aware of any evidence for the use of emblemata set in vaults of mosaic or pumice in Hadrianic features at the Villa.[22] The wall and ceiling fragments suggest that cut glass mosaic was used particularly for the apses of niches[23] and at least once for the large curving roofs of a fountain building (the Scenic Triclinium semi dome and the barrel vault behind), where it must have glittered spectacularly where water reflected on it. There is no evidence that I am aware of from the Villa of the decoration of whole fountains or whole niches with mosaic. There are instances where scattered tesserae in the area of a decorative basin might suggest the basin was mosaic lined. However, we have yet to find mosaic still embedded in a decorative basin at the Villa and it is equally possible that tesserae moved to their apparent location during earlier excavation or

---

[18] Small mosaic figures were embedded in an extensive backdrop of red or yellow painted pumice (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.163). Lavagne and Wattel De Croizant 1984 741 prefer a Flavian date. The design and use of pumice is comparable to non-fountain walls from the House of Apollo at Pompeii (Sear 1977 Cat.27).

[19] Lavagne 1988 411ff for a more complex view of the significance of pumice.

[20] Yellow scrolls in the Scenic Triclinium, a velarium pattern in the Peristyle Pool Building latrine (Sear 1977 Cat.104 and 97). The mosaic pilasters that Sear 1977 Cat.107 attributes to the Villa are eighteenth century (Parlasca 1958 177).

[21] The surviving mosaic pictures (MacDonald and Pinto 1995 163-164; Dunbabin 1999 27 and 66), where provenance is known, came from floors, not walls or vaults. A number are modern fabrications, though perhaps from salvaged material (an uncritical list at De Franceschini 1991 675).

[22] Some form of decoration appears to have been removed from the niches of the pre-Hadrianic Fountain room south of the Water Court (Cat.1 R6).

[23] Evidence from Scenic Triclinium and Canal apsed niches in the hemicycle and extension niches, and the (?) Hadrianic re working of the Cistern Fountain (Cat.1 R2, Fig.9.1). The apses of latrines in Fountain Court East, the upper level of the Peristyle Pool Building, and the Scenic Triclinium all contain traces of mosaic. Sear 1977 Cat.100 reports traces of mosaic in the large niches of the east hemicycle of the Arcaded Triclinium plus fallen mosaic, it is not quite clear where Chillman 1924 112 saw tesserae in the Arcaded Triclinium.

clearance.[24] As outlined in 8.1.1, mosaic lined pools are uncommon in Italy prior to Hadrian, outside baths, and the Villa decoration does not appear to mark a change in this pattern.[25]

Paint and stucco are rarely found in close association with decorative water features at the Villa.[26] Paint and stucco have generally survived poorly at the Villa[27] but in any event pumice, mosaic and marble facings would generally prove more robust in damp or humid conditions and might be preferred, where money was no object.[28] A painted niche apse has survived in the Fountain stibadium (Cat.1 H8) but it is doubtful that the niche itself contained water. However there are several locations where important painted, or possibly mosaic, panels are likely to have been part of the wider decoration of the feature – in particular the shallow niches in the ring wall of the Island Enclosure and of the Water feature adjoining the Water Court. We do have somewhat better information about the subject matter of friezes placed in the neighbourhood of some water features at the Island Enclosure, the Water Court and the Scenic Triclinium and Canal.[29] Details and materials vary but the themes are very similar – marine themes, cupids, hunting.

There is considerable evidence of the almost universal use of white marble at the Villa for the lining of decorative pools (large or small)[30] and water steps.[31] It seems to have been used generally also to face block fountains[32] but cipollino is reported in the Arcaded Triclinium (see Cat.1 H10). Cat.1 H13 expresses doubt about the alleged use of cipollino for the Small Baths wall basins. 4.3.4 explains why I believe that the Hadrianic lining of the Cavea fountain at the east corner of the Residence (Cat.1 R5)

---

[24] Tesserae in front of the rear wall niched fountain in the Water Court (Sear 1977 Cat.99) may well have come from the apses of the niches. See Cat 1 H2 for the puzzle of tesserae in the area of the fountains outside in Fountain Court. Hoffmann 1980 suggests a mosaic lining for the pool in the north building of the Stadium Garden , but does not cite evidence..

[25] The twin basins of the caldarium (De Franceschini 1991 GT38) of the Large Baths had white mosaic floors.

[26] But the covering of the ring wall of the Island Enclosure, first paint, then stucco, should be noted. The Island itself seems to have been dominated by marble again.

[27] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 151-157 gives a good summary.

[28] The generalisation in Joyce 1981 56 that figural painting survived into the second and third centuries in 'baths and nymphaea' is not borne out by the meagre evidence she quotes or by evidence at the Villa. I am a little more dubious than MacDonald and Pinto 1995 152 about the reliability of the impressions of eighteenth century visitors of painted figures.

[29] Respectively see Caprino in Ueblacker 1985, Conti 1970, Pensabene 1976 (black frieze) and Adriano 2000 210 (white).

[30] For example Cat.1 H2 feature 4 (Fig.27).

[31] For example on the steps of the arched niches in the Scenic Triclinium hemicycle Cat.1 H17.

[32] For example Cat.1 H2 feature 1 (Fig.23.1).

was white marble rather than plaster. The material used for lining for the Peristyle Pool (Cat.1 H11) is unclear.

The surviving evidence (cramp holes or tiny fragments) suggests that marble facings were used on the walls of water features, including the vertical surfaces of niches, in preference to mosaic,[33] accompanied by architectural mouldings and framings.[34] Not enough remains to permit the full reconstruction of the design or coloration of the marble facings of any single wall at the Villa, whether part of a water feature or not. However the cramp holes and fragments, together with the limited evidence for other decorative materials discussed above, show that the viewer looking at, say, the Fountain wall by the Small Baths, the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure, the Island itself, the Arcaded Triclinium, the main buildings of the Water Court, the Scenic Triclinium and nearby water feature,[35] would see marble, or pumice, as the backdrop for freestanding works of art, or water, rather than paint or mosaic. In this respect the Villa not surprisingly follows the general decorative line shown by the imperial dwellings in Rome. Features at the Villa have for example far more in common in terms of surface decoration with the elaborate marbled façade of the Bagni di Livia rather than, say, the small mosaic fountains of Pompeii. These have no visible counterparts or decorative descendants at the Villa. Large-scale water features substantially covered with mosaic are in fact hard to find generally[36] and marble facings more common in these larger features. This is consistent with the high value still ascribed to marble and especially to coloured stone, as illustrated by the poems of Statius where the varieties of applied marble are a key feature of his descriptions of the luxurious decoration of the Villas of Manilius Vopiscus, Pollius Felix and the dining room of Domitian.[37]

---

[33] For example in Cat.1 H5, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18.
[34] For example the pilasters and supports of the Water Court five niche fountain (Fig.74.3), the supports on the Fountain wall adjoining the Small Baths (Fig.66), the traces of framing in the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure (Fig.36.2), and those recorded for the Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium and Canal (Cat.1 H18).
[35] To name only those major features whose general surface materials are ascertainable.
[36] A large structure which came to light under Via XX Settembre in the 60s and probably formed part of the Horti Sallustiani, is sometimes cited but there is no clear evidence that it actually contained water. De Vos (De Vos 1997 Chapter 2 especially 70-71, and De Vos 1994) says there was no water in the upper storey (contra Sear 1977 Cat.46) and can only hypothesise a reflecting pool at the lower.
[37] Respectively *Silvae* 1.3.36; 2.2.86-93 (7 marbles in 8 lines); 4.2.26-30 (6 marbles in 5 lines)

8.2 Point of exit decoration

8.2.1 Precedents

The point at which water emerged into the open air from a pipe might be elaborated or decorated in various ways other than by use of a fountain figure. Straightforward bronze nozzles varied in design and also distribution in order to achieve different effects. At the south end of the garden in the House of the Vettii[38] the central fountain pipe in a shallow basin had a diameter of only 0.05cm, producing a fine but high jet. Wall paintings[39] show that in some raised basins the central jet spouted under the surface of the water, producing a bubbling effect rather than a jet. In other places jets spouted into a pool (or even a gutter)[40] sometimes from several points around the pool circumference.[41]

Where water flowed from a wall the point of exit might be decorated with a representation of the face of a mythological being or an animal, often in very flat relief, carved in stone or cast in metal. Facial representations occur in niches but also regularly on flat surfaces.[42] Over half the 37 decorations identified by Eschebach 1982 at the spouts of the public fountains of Pompeii are facial representations and half of these are faces of deities or mythological beings. Here and elsewhere, water deities are represented. Their function as source makes them ideally suited for waterspouts. They are commonly identified as 'Oceanus' though the iconography is difficult and some may have been intended as local river gods.[43] The lion head is another subject and appears throughout antiquity, not just for decorative water but also for points of public supply, guttering and so on.[44] Occasionally heads, especially animal heads,

---

[38] Pompeii VI 15 1.
[39] For example Pompeii VI 17 42 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Fig 406). For the use of wall paintings as evidence see 3.4 .
[40] VIII 4 4 – bronze pipes concealed in columns alongside gutter (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.429).
[41] For example Pompeii III 2 1 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.156): 12 jets around and one in the centre.
[42] Especially in more public contexts: the public fountains surveyed by Eschebach 1982; Via Appia KM 140 (Neuerburg 1965 Cat.59); 2 examples from Sepino (Maiuri 1929b 216-218).
[43] Examples from the Hadrianic period or earlier include: marble, lead pipe in mouth (Pompeii Inv. 20362, detailed provenance lost); stone (Eschebach 1982 Figs 24, 34); bronze face (Weißenberg Römer-Museum Magazin, Tölle-Kastenbein 1992 448ff); from the frigidarium of the baths at Glanum (Rolland 1946 54-56); marble, lower level of Pompeii II 5 2 (House of Loreius Tiburtinus). Examples of what I believe to be river gods with mouths open for pipes are Villa Albani Inv. 171 and Ny Carlsberg Inv. 1772.
[44] Glaser 1987 105ff for representations of lion head spouts on Greek vases.

were almost three-dimensional, though still firmly seated in the wall (Fig.123.2 shows protuberant feline spouts from the Villa dei Papiri).[45]

Faces in the form of theatrical masks seem to be ideally suited for decorating water outlets, with their pierced mouths (and eyes), and given that the theatrical mask was generally popular as a decorative motif.[46] However theatrical masks have rarely been found in situ acting as fountain spouts and suggestions or assumptions by modern authors that a theatrical mask acted as a fountain spout need to be examined very closely. In the survey in Eschebach 1982, only two of the thirty-seven decorated public water basins at Pompeii used theatrical masks. In Campania and at Sperlonga, masks form part of the decoration of water features[47] but they do not normally actually act as spouts. Apart from the examples from public fountains in Eschebach 1982, the only certain example I know of theatrical mask as spout from Pompeii is the mask made of stones and shells in the House of the Small Fountain (VI 8 23).[48] There are examples from Campania and elsewhere of cupids or boys holding masks which function as spouts.[49] On the other hand we do know that large stone masks were used as relief decoration in theatres[50] and in the absence of clear find spot evidence or internal evidence for pipework, stone theatrical masks should not be assumed to be

---

[45] These 11 feline (tiger?) bronze spouts appear, from the excavation records, to have been attached to a lead basin, not to a wall, though I find that a little unlikely given the thickness of the supply pipes still attached to some of them, clearly visible on the right of Fig.123.2 (Wojcik 1986 229 L3 with further bibliography). Lion head spouts discharging into troughs can be seen in a painting from the House of Diomedes, now at Naples (Inv. 8593) and perhaps these spouts discharged into such a (lead) trough.

[46] See Paris 1990 for a more exhaustive treatment of the variety of media and roles in which theatrical masks are found.

[47] For example the House of Neptune and Amphitrite (Herculaneum V 1) has three masks above the mosaic fountain, the House of the Large Fountain (Pompeii VI 8 22) a mask either side. Iacopi G 1963 147f speculates that the three stone masks found at Sperlonga (two of an indisputably theatrical character) were used as screens for lights to create a dramatic effect. There is no sign of fountain spouts in the grotto.

[48] Doubtful examples from Pompeii include:

- House of the Scientist (VI 14 43) - female mask on a pillar from which the water flowed in a mosaic fountain. Removed and ?lost, so the type cannot now be checked (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.293)
- Pompeii V 3 11 - Jashemski 1979-1993 II No.189 references a marble fountain mask of a woman (apparently also now lost). The detailed excavation report (Paribeni 1902a 371) however makes it clear that this mask was not found in situ as a fountain, and the general description fits a theatrical mask.
- Pompeii VI 15 5 - Silenus mask found in garden, but neither find spot nor the fact that the mouth was bored through confirm the suggestion (Mau 1898 20) that it was a spout (present location not known, Kapossy 1969 59).

[49] Bronze examples from the Villa dei Papiri (MNN Inv.nos.5030, 5028). Kapossy 1969 42 gives more examples.

[50] For example the Theatre of Marcellus at Rome (Gasparri 1996 235 with further bibliography).

fountain masks, simply because the mouth is pierced through, as it would be in a real theatrical mask.[51]

Facial or relief representations were far from ubiquitous as point of exit decoration for the niche fountains of Pompeii which commonly used three-dimensional sculpture instead. Sometimes the subject is known,[52] sometimes a pedestal only survives.[53] Sometimes a plain gap for a standing figure is clearly left in the mosaic pattern of a fountain niche (see Fig.137.3). Other possible solutions included bronze slots.[54]

Finally, little has been written about fountain spouts which are three-dimensional yet fall short of being fountain figures, and are not containers (discussed in 8.3). Surviving examples include marble rhytons,[55] a ship's prow[56] but simpler examples in the form of elaborated columns survive.[57] Pierced pinecones appear to have been popular and we have examples in bronze ranging from life size to colossal.[58]

8.2.2 At the Villa

The direct evidence for point of exit decoration at the Villa is very limited. No metal nozzles have survived. Excluding niches, there were multiple jets in only two

---

[51] For example a satyr theatrical mask suggested as fountain spout (Lugli 1926 578) though there is no clear evidence from form or find spot (cf Neudecker 1988 Cat.24). Two unusual profile theatrical masks in Rome are often said to have been steam outlets from baths (Palazzo Altemps, MNR I/5 No. 79 and Villa Albani, Bol 1989-98 I 42 Cat 8).
[52] House of the Scientist (VI 14 43) Mars.
[53] House of the Bear (VII 2 45).
[54] At Pompeii VI 8 22 and VII 2 45. A bronze clipeus from the Suburban Baths at Pompeii had water flowing from a semicircular slot in folds of drapery held at waist height by a satyr (Rediscovering Pompeii 1992 Cat.185).
[55] Rhytons have an obvious 'liquid' connection – in the 1st century AD example now in Centrale Montemartini (Jones H S 1912-26 II 165 No. 25) the water came up from below and out between the knees of the chimaera at the pointed end; there is a similar, smaller example in the Museo Nazionale Romano (MNR 1/1 233 No. 147).
[56] Originally, probably, forming a base for something else, in the Capitoline Museum, in the form of a boar's head with a spout either side (Mustilli 1939 No. 26).
[57] For example a tall slender shaft (1.9m high and 0.15m diameter) in the British Museum, elaborately decorated with foliage and a serpent from whose mouth the water issued (Smith A H 1892-1904 III No. 2538).
[58] 0.17m high from the House of Camillus Pompeii VI 12 22/3 (Dwyer 1982 59-60 with another example), also British Museum Inv. 2579, and the enormous (height 4m) example in Cortile della Pigna at the Vatican (Lembke 1994 251 Cat.60).

structures – the block fountain in the Arcaded Triclinium[59] and the canal in the north sector of the Stadium Garden.[60]

In many places it is not even possible to detect, any more, where or if a pipe might have emerged from wall or floor. This might give some clues about decoration at that point though I have been unable to devise any methodology which would enable us to tell whether a pipe in a basin led to a container, a fountain figure, or just a simple jet or spout, in the absence of further archaeological evidence such as fragments of one or another.[61] If we can see from a channel that a pipe exited half way up a niche, it gives no clues as to whether it supplied a facial representation or a fountain figure.

It is not clear how the remains of the two pipes in the Cavea fountain in the Residence (Cat.1 R5) functioned. They appear to exit either side of a window at the top of the back wall (they protrude from the back wall in Fig.13.2). They are over 2m directly above the sloping basin below. Salza Prina Ricotti has suggested a very small shallow basin below them with water falling into it from the pipes.[62] However if water spouted at any pressure it would hit the basin hard and if water did not spout at pressure, the effect would be a not particularly attractive small trickle. So perhaps in fact the pipes originally continued down the wall from their exit points (concealed behind the wall facings) and fed into the canal around the top of the basin slope. In other words the extant fragments of pipe do not show exit points but were parts of pipework originally hidden.

There are a number of extant theatrical type masks from the Villa but although they are often carelessly described as fountain masks, closer examination shows that either they were not pierced at all, or that they might have served as decoration, like much mask material, for non fountain areas.[63]

---

[59] Chillman 1924 119 and Plate 54.2.
[60] Hoffmann 1980 19.
[61] For example, no evidence has been discovered as to whether there might be a decorated outlet in the centre of the two pools in the Arcaded Triclinium (Cat.1 H10) or the pool in the north sector of the Stadium Garden (H12). Whether and where the wall niches in the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure (H5) and the Fountain stibadium (H8) were pierced, is not now clearly visible (to cite but two of many examples).
[62] See Cat.1 R5.
[63] See Cat.2 exclusions 11, 12, 14 and 15.

In fact the architectural water features at the Villa which include walls or niches have some characteristics which make it less likely that they used facial representations. First water steps often occur at the bottom of niches.[64] In order for water to trickle down these, from top to bottom, the water should flow from a point at the bottom of the niche, rather than spout from the point higher up where a facial representation would normally be centred in a niche. Second there is the sheer scale of many of these water features. They were often elevated, and often put horizontal distance between viewer and feature through the use of frontal pools.[65] The usual medallion shape of a facial representation neither filled such niches adequately nor would it have been clearly visible from a distance. Therefore, as described above for Pompeii, it seems likely that often a figure, or fountain figure sculpture, rather that a facial representation, occupied the niches of many Villa fountains.

Where then might the colossal Oceanus mask (Cat.2 B2) originally have been located? The Catalogue entry explains why I believe it was designed for a niche not a flat wall and its oblong rather than round shape would fit the proportions of a niche. The projection of the beard and chin would encourage the water to fan out. It is impossible to say whether the Oceanus was used in one of the baths at the Villa, or elsewhere. Possible locations among the decorative water features include[66] the Fountain under the Doric Temple (Cat.1 R1, Fig.6.1). Here, in the Hadrianic version at least, the water would spray from the main niche into the pool, but the mask would be fairly distant from the viewer. Other possibilities are the large niche in the rear extension of the Fountain south east of the Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H18, Fig.91.2), or perhaps even one of the four corner fountains of the Water Court main building (Cat.1 H14, Fig.73.1) with their deep frontal basins. Doubts about the provenance and a possible later date for the Oceanus are discussed in the Catalogue entry.

---

[64] I believe these can be detected at the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure (Cat.1 H5), the Fountain stibadium (H8), the Water Court (rear wall in main building H14), and in the hemicycle of the Scenic Triclinium (H17).

[65] For example at the Fountain facing the Island Enclosure (Cat.1 H5), the Water Court (H14) and the Scenic Triclinium (H17), also the Fountain room under the Doric Temple (R1).

[66] I exclude those which have niches disproportionately large, or small, or which have pedestals or decoration which suggests there was a fountain statue. Bearing in mind that the water would emerge part way up the niche I have looked for locations without water steps and with a pool or channel to receive water sprayed out. All this narrows down the possibilities considerably.

8.3 Water containers

8.3.1 Precedents: where they were used

As water emerged into the open air it might fall simply into a pool or floor basin, or jet from a fountain statue, but very often a freestanding container was used to hold and display it. They survive in museums and other collections, are mentioned in the literary sources, and shown in wall paintings. As indicated at 3.4 there has not yet been a full study of these containers and this section is a necessarily very brief survey of the evidence prior to Hadrian.

Fountains consisting of a container were popular in gardens where they were usually set in a shallow catchment pool. Apart from the surviving examples from Campania and Ostia[67] they are frequently illustrated in wall paintings of gardens. Almost half the known Campanian rooms with garden paintings show a water container or water containers in the garden and about half the water containers shown *clearly* functioned as fountains[68] - that is to say they show a jet or bubbling effect in the middle of the container (see Fig.121 for examples from Oplontis). Other well-preserved paintings depict a basin of water with absolutely no bubbling or jetting water, similar to birdbaths.[69] The rest of the container paintings *may* also have shown a fountain effect but I have been unable to satisfy myself about this from the reproductions or descriptions. In the north courtyard garden of the Villa at Oplontis representations of basins with no playing jet, and crater types with jets, alternate on the wall.[70]

If we assume that the calm surfaces shown in the garden paintings also occurred in real life, there are several possible explanations. There might have been water basins in gardens with no piped supply which were filled either naturally by rainwater or manually. Alternatively the paintings might signify a basin with the jet or supply turned off, or a low-pressure water basin whose level was regulated so as not to fill up

---

[67] For example Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.249; for Ostia see Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 II Fontane a piede catalogue entries.
[68] I have used the catalogue of garden paintings in Jashemski 1979-1993 II App.II Cat.1-121 for this analysis. The reliability of the garden paintings as evidence is discussed at 3.4.
[69] The garden paintings often show birds drinking from a water basin (I 12 16 Jashemski 1979-1993 II App.II Cat.22 for example).
[70] Jashemski 1979-1993 I Fig 470.

or overflow. Regulation could be via an open pipe with the opening at the desired level – water rising above this level would flow into the pipe and be carried away.[71] Examples survive of basins with piercings around the edge to regulate water level.[72] The garden paintings do not show overflowing basins nor do they show basins supplied by an outside jet or pipe but these existed in practice.[73] Containers were also regularly placed in the impluvium basins in atria in the Campanian houses. The elaboration of the impluvium with jets and basins is discussed at 5.2.3.

Although many of the basins now found in museum collections have no detailed provenance, the town houses of Pompeii and Herculaneum preserve many examples of basins from gardens and atria. The basin from the House of the Ceii atrium has been studied in detail (Andersson 1991). From the villas around come a plain crater fountain (Villa San Marco, found in situ at the end of the large pool Fig.122.2);[74] a double handled labrum fountain (peristyle garden, Villa del Pastore, Fig.122.1)[75] and from the villa at Oplontis a relief crater again found in situ in its floor basin, at the end of the large pool (Fig.125 92).[76]

8.3.2 Precedents: shapes and features of containers

The container types in the wall paintings are almost invariably flat and shallow basins (about three quarters of identifiable containers, Fig.121.1 and 3) or crater shaped (Fig.121.2). There is no apparent correlation between container shape and the representation or non-representation of an active fountain - they are shown (and not shown) in basin and crater types. It has been argued that craters were not, in real life, actually used as fountains,[77] but in my view the evidence of the paintings, and the

---

[71] Pliny *Ep.*5.6.37 describes such a regulation device – but his device is hidden.
[72] For example Andersson 1991 passim; bigio morato basin MNR I/1 No.92.
[73] At the House of the Vettii (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.294) the fountains round the edge of the peristyle all discharged into the gutter. They included basins fed by external pipes. Two small fountains in the centre discharged into the soil (maybe they could be turned on and off to prevent water logging). On a grander scale, the bigio morato basin referred to immediately above did not have an internal supply.
[74] Antiquarium Stabiae Inv.63853.
[75] Antiquarium Stabiae Inv.63894. Comparable to Jones H S 1912-26 II 148 No.34 (though it is not clear here or elsewhere whether this heavily restored item was a fountain); and Spinazzola 1928 Tav. 41 (possibly Ruesch 1908 Atrio Ala orientale Inv. 6870).
[76] De Caro 1987 96ff.
[77] Grassinger 1991 148 and Das Wrack 1994 275-276. In addition to the physical craters and painting evidence she discounts, she also notes and presumably discounts Pliny's use of the term crater in the context of a playing fountain (*Ep.*5.6.23) and an image on a silver cup. In addition to the paintings showing crater fountains on the ground there is a painting of a nymph holding a crater fountain (IX 2 7

direct evidence from Campania, put the matter beyond doubt.[78] In fact restoration and loss of context has possibly destroyed evidence that still more of them were used as fountains.

Oblong shallow troughs on two or more legs do not occur in the garden paintings but they are clearly visible in the peristyle garden at the House of the Vettii, where they stand free.[79] Large (2m long) examples survive from other private contexts.[80] Deeper troughs, of rounded oblong (bath) shape, generally of coloured stone, have a stronger association with baths, and are therefore outside the scope of this study.[81]

The wall paintings do include metallic containers and there are some bronze examples from Pompeii.[82] Little is known about the uses and frequency of lead containers. Muscettola 1982 studied 35 decorated lead buckets from Campania, standing, where known, in atrium or peristyle, usually with a tap/overflow arrangement. The lost lead container linked with the bronze feline spouts from the Villa dei Papiri (Fig.123.2) hints at a more sophisticated design – maybe even a trough - but the shape is not properly recorded by the excavation records.[83]

The surviving basins are usually on a tall single column. The paintings sometimes show sphinx (Fig.121.1) and centaur supports.[84] A satyr support for a fountain basin survives from a villa near Pompeii,[85] and in the museum at Naples there is a Scylla(?) support for a basalt basin.[86] Occasionally a tripod rather than a single central support

---

Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.470). The matter does not appear to be in doubt for Cohon reviewing Grassinger at *JRA* 6 (1993) 316ff.

[78] In addition to the examples from Oplontis and San Marco (see 8.3.1) there is a further relief crater from San Marco said to have been a fountain (Fig.122.3, Barbet and Miniero 1999 I 311-12). This is now in the museum at Naples Inv.6779. Other discussion of this crater is very confusing. The excavation report says it showed 9 figures and gives the inventory number 6779. Grassinger 1991 Cat.21 however says that Inv.6779 came from the Villa dei Papiri, but the relief on 6779 does not tie up with the excavation report for the Papiri crater. Finally, Jashemski 1979-1993 I Fig.131 shows another crater as from San Marco. However the crater shown is actually MNN Inv.6778 and is from the Farnese collection (Grassinger 1991 Cat.20). It appears that Jashemski has accidentally used an illustration of 6778 instead of 6779.

[79] Illustrated for example at Farrar 1998, first page of colour plates.

[80] Ambrogi 1995 Cat. A II 18 and 19.

[81] Ambrogi 1995 especially 13f for typology and 41f for usage. Also 59f for chronology where she ascribes most production to the second century AD onwards. Bol 1989-98 II 248 Cat.220 is also useful.

[82] House of the Menander (I 10 4/14-17) - see Maiuri A 1932 428 where he also describes Spinazzola 1928 No. 40 (not, so far as I am aware, dealt with extensively elsewhere).

[83] See n.45 above.

[84] See Cat.2C 14.

[85] Jashemski 1979-1992 II Cat.592, Paribeni 1902b 575. The lead pipe ran up his back and into the bowl.

[86] Spinazzola 1928 Tav. 43, MNN Inv. 6862.

is shown in the paintings.[87] Tripod fountains are uncommon in the archaeological record as well and are discussed further at 8.3.3 below.

The archaeological record adds to the moderately sized containers shown in the wall paintings[88] and surviving from Pompeii and Ostia, several much larger and more elaborately decorated basins which very probably contained water even though evidence of the water inlet/outlet mechanisms has not survived. These include a basin with reliefs of olives and birds from the area of the Lacus Iuturnae,[89] a basin with acanthus decoration,[90] and a basin with elaborate handles displayed in the Domus Aurea.[91] In no case do we know how they worked or where they were located originally.

Virtually all containers in the paintings are white. There are traces of colour (red, blue and gold) on the Oplontis crater.[92] Coloured marble containers and colossal marble containers are not shown in the garden paintings but basins with both characteristics have survived. The basins from the baths at Pompeii and Herculaneum are usually of coloured marble.[93] In other locations there are coloured basins of very large size

---

[87] For example Pompeii I 7 10-12/19 Jashemski 1979-1993 II App.II Cat.9; I 11 16 Jashemski 1979-1993 II App.II Cat.18; VII 9 27 40/41 Jashemski 1979-1993 II App.II Cat.79; Herculaneum Sacellum Jashemski 1979-1993 II App.II Cat.112.

[88] The scale of the paintings suggests the flat basins would be at waist level and less than 1m across, the craters somewhat taller.

[89] Steinby 1989 249ff. Restored diameter 2.15m

[90] Börker 1973, with preceding bibliography. Diameter 2.05m. Now in Museo Nazionale Romano, Centrale Montemartini. The Mustilli 1939 photograph (Tav. 61) clearly shows a central hole in the basin.

[91] Room 90, June 2001. No inventory number visible, illustrated at Lugli 1968 11. Estimated diameter 1.5m.

[92] De Caro 1987 96.

[93] For example: cipollino basin from the caldarium of the Suburban Baths at Herculaneum (Maiuri A 1958 Fig. 132-3); cipollino basin from the apodyterium of the Forum Baths Maiuri A 1958 Fig, 72; portasanta basin on a white support from the frigidarium of the Pisanella villa baths (a white marble one from the caldarium, Della Corte 1921 442ff). Manderscheid 2000b 503 confirms that such basins never had an internal overflow but simply splashed onto the surrounding floor.

which very probably contained water.[94] The original location of these basins can usually only be surmised.[95]

8.3.3 At the Villa

Many of the garden areas in which water containers and built water features might be located at the Villa have not been properly explored – for example the East Terraces adjoining Cat.1 H7 (Fig.1 6), the Residence Quadrangle (Fig 1 16) , the area in front of the Fountain wall adjoining the Small Baths Cat.1 H13. Most of the large pools discussed at 5.1 do not contain pedestals suitable for the location of water containers but there are also a series of known smaller pools set in architectural frameworks (5.2) which, potentially, might have held water containers (or fountain statues).

Catalogue 2A gives details of the three water containers from the Villa whose complete original appearance is reasonably certain: Cat.2 A1, A2 and A6. All three are tripod fountains, which I have said crop up relatively infrequently in the pictorial record and in the archaeological record. The pictorial representations of tripod fountains however tend to show basins with rather attenuated and delicate features – similar to bronze tripod forms - rather than the solid designs we have here. I have identified only five definite examples of tripod fountains from Italy, outside the Villa.[96] It is impossible to give a comparative number for the quantity of single support fountain basins found in Italy – no published survey of fountain basins currently exists and compiling one is beyond the scope of this study – but a cursory glance at the Rome collections and the containers in Naples indicates they were far

---

[94]Varming 1965 explores four basins surviving in Rome, the largest with a diameter of 6.76m. To these might be added, on a smaller and/or more elaborate scale

- Breccia corallina - diameter c2m - Museo Capitolino (Conservatori, Sala dei Capitani.).
- Porphyry - diameter 2.9m - Naples MNN ?Inv. 6021 (ex Farnese 166)
- Pavonazzetto – diameter 2m - Vatican, Vestibolo Rotondo Inv. 1144
- Recently discovered fragments from a porphyry basin – diameter 3.5m - located near the Templum Pacis (Ambrogi 1998 passim).

[95] The potential locations identified by Varming 1965 include public areas in the Forum, the Baths of Trajan, and the Domus Aurea. The Naples basin above is perhaps to be identified with one of two from the Baths of Caracalla (DeLaine 1997 34). The Templum Pacis basin was in a public location.

[96] Despite the comments about frequency at Bol 1989-98 II No. 177, p 87 and n.6 which cites 3 examples. The first is the Museo Nazionale sphinx tripod fountain dealt with above. I have been unable to identify or find out any further information about the Venice example cited. The third example from the Louvre (MA 357, Clarac 1841-53 II 269 No. 51) has no central support and seems unlikely to have functioned as a fountain.

more numerous. The surviving numbers of tripod basins are more equivalent to those of the colossal coloured marble basins.[97]

The five Italian examples from outside the Villa are as follows. In the Museo Nazionale Romano is a 0.96m high, 1.3m diameter basin on three sturdy lion's feet which differs from the Villa examples both in its proportions and its elaborate relief decoration (marine thiasos) all around the broad upright basin and handles. There is no consensus on date – 1st century AD or earlier.[98] A tripod in Museo Torlonia, height 1.8m, diameter 1.85, has a similar design.[99] The subject of the main relief is Hercules and a Dionysiac thiasos. In the Villa Albani there is a 0.69m high, 0.86m diameter basin with legs constructed of lion's paws and griffin protomes dated again to the 1st century AD.[100] The basin has shell ribs inside and out. There is another smaller example also in the Villa Albani, height 0.34, diameter 0.57m,[101] again with the decoration focussed simply on the sphinx-like legs. Fifthly and finally[102] in the Museo Nazionale at Naples there is another sphinx-supported basin, height 1.02 and diameter 1.34m (Fig.123.1).[103]

The known tripods from the Villa do not have the elaborate relief decoration of the first two examples. Cat.2 A6 (Fig.107) with its lion-griffin legs does however indicate some continuity with, particularly, the sphinx leg tripod in Naples (Fig.123.1) though the latter is smaller and much lower. Cat.2 A1 and A2 belong to a different tradition. Since A2 (Fig.106) is only known from illustrations and there are puzzling aspects to its design, any conclusions about it can only be tentative.[104] However it has a number of features in common with A1. Although we do not know its size, the proportions are similar, as are the square cut legs with lion feet and vegetal decoration on the outer

---

[97] N.94 above for numbers.
[98] MNR 1/1 No. 159 with preceding bibliography.
[99] Gasparri 1980 No. 297 with preceding bibliography.
[100] Bol 1989-98 II No. 177.
[101] Bol 1989-98 III No. 268. Here (n.4) Bol compares it to a sphinx basin (lost) excavated at Porta del Popolo; it is not clear to me from the illustration and description at Antonini 1821 III Tav. 23 however that this was a fountain, as no central support/supply is shown.
[102] Jacques 1902 Pl. 8 shows a fragment, one leg from a probable tripod basin featuring a cupid holding grapes. Bol 1989-98 III No.268 n.6 wonders whether a complete tripod in Villa Spiagarelli incorporates this fragment (Chiarucci 1989 63 illustration) – but the position of the hands and wings are different. Neither he nor I have examined the Villa Spiagarelli basin to confirm that it is ancient.
[103] MNN Inv.6866. Bol 1989-98 III No. 268 n.6 wonders how this is related to a basin shown in Roccheggiani 1804 I Tav.41.2 – it is very probable that they are one and the same though I have yet to establish exactly the route that the basin took from excavation at Ardea, to Naples, where it was one of the earliest objects donated to the museum.
[104] I am dubious about the elaborate central feature in the basin in the absence of any known parallels, also the 'fruit basket' central support.

edge (compare Fig.102 and 106). Again the decorative features of the bowl are similar but A1 is more elaborate with its lion head spouts[105] and figured capitals.[106] In general I would characterise the ornamentation of Cat.2 A1 and A2 as borrowing from architectural motifs rather than figured work (whereas the reverse could be said of the MNR and Torlonia basins). The inhabited vegetal patterns seen on the legs of A1 (Fig.104) and the central support of A6 (Fig. 108.1) find parallels on several pilasters from the Villa,[107] but as can be seen from the above, it is difficult to find parallels either among the extant or painted tripod fountains for key features of A1 and 2 especially the square cut legs.[108]

There are interesting connections between the design of marble tripod fountains and the design of marble tripod tables – items which might have been produced within the same workshops. Tripod tables are apparently much more common than are tripod fountains (20% of the Moss 1988 table Catalogue) but they almost invariably use feline legs and never rectangular cut legs which are reserved for rectangular tables.[109] The elaboration of the Scylla capitals of Cat.2 A1 is without parallel among the table supports recorded by Moss. All this tends to bolster the picture of the Cat.2 A1 and A2 as unusually sophisticated and indeed original examples of their already unusual type – luxury objects par excellence.[110]

So where might the tripod fountains from the Villa have been used, and why? The garden paintings clearly show tripod basins, like other basins, being used on their own, outside in gardens, and that is possible.[111] There are a large number of places in the Villa where this could have happened - the gardens are largely unexplored, or the

---

[105] Other examples of basins with integral overflow spouts include a large bigio morato basin (MNR 1/1 128 No. 92 Inv. 361) which the excavation reports indicate came from a house, and the much smaller basin from the House of the Ceii (Andersson 1991 passim).

[106] Naturally the 'restorer' who Penna 1831-36 III No.64 says worked on Cat.2 A2 may have been inspired by the well-published Cat.2 A1. MNR 1/1 No. 92 Inv. 361 cites a red marble tripod then in the Louvre as a comparison for A1 but in fact this is modern (and no longer in the Louvre collection).

[107] Conveniently illustrated at Adriano 2000 Cat.20. Or even earlier a simpler fountain support from Oplontis (De Caro 1987 120 Cat.35)

[108] Lost fragments from the Villa dei Quintili (built a little later than Hadrian's Villa) are tantalisingly suggestive of a tripod with channelled legs on lion feet (Ricci 1998 113 No. 103)

[109] Moss 1988 52.

[110] Surviving table leg fragments from the Villa (Moss 1988 Cat. A106; A180 (=Cat.2 exclusions 13); A181 and A182) all have unusual table leg subjects – a lion griffin type (cf here Cat.2 A6), a cupid with shell, another holding an object, and a sphinx.

[111] A good illustration is the garden painting from the Auditorium of Maecenas which shows a larger than usual view of a formal garden framed by two squat tripods (not apparently fountains, perhaps bird bath type), Vespignani and Visconti 1874 Tav. 17.3.

destruction is such that decoration cannot be established.[112] They are very unlikely on the other hand to have been used in the Villa baths. The predominant type of basin in baths used for washing or splashing was a simple basin on a single leg, which overflowed continuously onto the floor; better class baths would express their superiority via larger basins or the use of special stone.[113] Cat.2 A1 is too tall to have any practical use and the water spouting from the lion heads made it less accessible.[114] Some other spaces can be eliminated for A1 on the grounds of size or shape.[115]

There is no definitive proof of where A1 was located, but the identifiable possibilities are, firstly, one of the side pools in the Water Court main building (A1 is too large for the central pool). The side pools though square are roomy enough (2.4m x 2.4m, Fig.70). Here such a basin would form the focus of a subset of rooms off the main axis of the building.

A second possibility is the Stadium Garden north building where the square pool is 4m x 4m (Fig.55). Although the square shape is not ideally suited to the tripod's shape, the pool is large enough to hide any jarring lines. Finally Arcaded Triclinium TE15 (basin 2.5 x 2.5m) and TE7 (2.0 x 1.8m) (see Fig.46). TE7 corresponds almost exactly to the minimum dimensions I have estimated for a rectangular pool to contain the fountain. These pools, in the Arcaded Triclinium and the Stadium Garden, are all elements in axial views over 100m long (east-west for the former, Fig.47, and north-south for the latter, Fig.56.2) both terminating, or starting, from probable dining rooms (Fig.55 room to the east of court 15, and room 2). Taking the Stadium Garden as example, the view passes along the canal and planting area, through the building with pool, past the open courtyard, terminating in a semicircular pool with the small grotto room at the centre and the stepped fountain basin behind (Fig.56.2).

---

[112] An example of the latter is the feature at the centre of the garden area in the east part of the Vestibule, where a space appears to have been left for the display of something, but we do not know what (area G Fig. 71 Salza Prina Ricotti 2001).
[113] See examples at n.93 above.
[114] I have assumed that the water jetting from the lions' heads hit the ground 0.3m away. I have also assumed that the tripod, which had six 'cardinal' points (3 jets and 3 legs) was best suited to a round pool but could be displayed in a rectangular or square basin, if large enough. It was unsuited to basins with more than 6 sides.
[115] The space at the centre of the Island Enclosure is too small and in any event reportedly contained a pedestal. The only large water basin which preserves pedestals, and pedestals big enough, is the Scenic Canal – but not only is there other sculpture already linked with these pedestals, the sheer expanse of surrounding water seems too large for these pieces anyway. There is no evidence of pedestals in the other large pools. Evidence of bases plus octagonal shape rules out the pools at each end of Fountain Court feature 3.

Looking along the axis the eye is drawn through a series of areas where the sense of space passing is given by columnar framing, by the alternation of light and dark for uncovered and covered spaces, and also by the sheen of different shapes of water.[116] The axis is potentially enlivened also by the inclusion of sculpture – basins or figures – or by water jets. However large sculpture might tend to block or confuse the lines of these views through. The jets produced by an essentially gravity-fed system would have been modest in size. In the context of these axial views this type of tripod fountain appears particularly appropriate. At close quarters A1 can be viewed from any angle. Although of plain white marble it has interesting details in the lion's head spouts, the play of water from them, and the inhabited scrolls on the outer surfaces of the legs. It can be placed symmetrically in an axial view through, and the height would not be so great as to block the view. The legs give the whole thing, despite the curvature of the basin, a rectangular appearance like the doors and windows which also frame the view – the outline is 'portrait' rather than 'landscape'. Finally the straight pilaster style legs with their fluting on two sides echo the columns which also frame the views all the way through. The more architectural style of tripod basins Cat.2 A1 could be inserted into a view like this more happily than say the elaborate and no doubt very expensive relief tripods or the more elaborate single foot basins which tend to be broader than they are high – 'landscape' rather than 'portrait'.

The basin known only from drawings, Cat.2 A2, is difficult to place within the Villa because its size is not indicated – but its legs and the shape of the basin have, as noted, much in common with the A1.

Cat.2 A6 is a very good fit for the central pool in the Water Court main suite where it would not have overwhelmed or dominated the other features and the rich decoration of the area, or blocked the view through and out. The floor basins in the side rooms, which were larger, would have dwarfed it.[117] I have not been able to establish where

---

[116] See also Hoffmann 1980 76 for marble colour contrasts.

[117] Bol 1989-98 III No. 268 including n.5 plus Bol 1989-98 II No. 177 87 give the impression that there is a pair of tripods from the Villa consisting of my Cat.2 A6 plus a basin represented by one fragment in the Villa storerooms. It is by no means clear that this fragment comes from a water basin – the top edge does not curve outward in the usual way, and also the scale is quite different. The conclusion he draws that such objects generally were displayed as pairs, and that this is such a pair, is not sustainable on this evidence. However the existence of pairs of floor basins at the Villa, and indeed at the Water Court, at least suggests other pairings as a possibility.

in the Water Court the fragments were found, but none of the other water spaces there appear suitable.

Turning now to what has not been found at the Villa, or what did not exist there, there are no identifiable examples of single leg water containers, which were as we have seen popular elsewhere, or any water containers made of coloured stone, or of troughs.[118] There are however containers which are not do not contain evidence of pipework, made of coloured stone.[119] Any metal containers, whether of lead or more precious metals, have totally vanished. I have mentioned at Cat.2 exclusions 5 two specific fragments in the Villa storerooms which might have come from water containers. Then there are the pastiches discussed at the Cat.2 explanatory note which may also contain fragments of water basins. A number of these are of crater form and here is another apparently missing category of water container from the Villa. Craters would nonetheless have suited various water basins at the Villa – for example those at the termini of Fountain Court feature 3. Notwithstanding Grassinger's view that the production of the category of craters she deals with was in decline by the second century AD,[120] it is evident that there was still the space and taste at the Villa for massive decorated stone containers.[121] The existence of crater type fountains at the Villa cannot be ruled out.

Conclusions

The use of surface decoration components for the water features, so far as it can be traced at the Villa, is broadly consistent with the established trends in larger dwellings - little natural stone, much white marble in pools and other marbles on vertical surfaces, mosaic in niche apses and ceilings. The substantial use of pumice is unexpected and indicates that unlike other pre-glass mosaic materials, pumice had not been abandoned.

---

[118] The trough standing in front of the Museo Didattico does not, confusingly, come from the Villa.
[119] For example: a two handled plain rosso antico cup 0.35 diameter (Vatican Candelabri Inv. 2785) allegedly from the Villa (Penna 1831-36 IV No. 119); an Egyptianising granite bell crater (see Hadrien 1999 Cat.79); a rosso antico square basin on a fluted support, with swans at the four corners, in the Vatican. The latter particularly might be a birdbath style water container, there are no signs of any pipework but it is very heavily restored. I have not been able to pin down the evidence for a Villa provenance, though it is has been accepted by many including Spinola 2000 No. 32 163.
[120] Summarised by Grassinger 1991 42-43.
[121] The Villa Lante vase (Angelicoussis 1992 Cat.82) is perhaps the most credible of these in terms of provenance and restoration.

Although it is not possible to say very much at all about point of exit decoration at the Villa, my research suggests that there were a wide variety of ways in which water could be presented as it emerged into the open air, and also that the attribution of theatrical masks as fountain spouts are often doubtful.

Contrary to recent research, I believe that large crater fountains as expensive luxury object may well have existed at the Villa, though they cannot be identified now. Tripod fountains are an unusual design, not found yet for example at Pompeii (or Campania anywhere), but they are found at the Villa where I have suggested some possible roles for them. Tripod fountains may often have been expensive luxury objects too as they are more difficult in design than a single leg fountain.

9.The decoration of water features at the Villa: fountain figures and sculpture found with water features

Introduction

The most extensive evidence from the Villa for the arrangement of statuary in and around water features comes from the 1950s excavation of the Scenic Triclinium and Canal and this is discussed at length in 9.4. First I have examined the sculpture found in association with other types of feature at the Villa, against its historical context, building up from pools, through structures with niches to grottoes and more generally groupings.

9.1 Statuary associated with pools

9.1.1 Precedents

There are many examples of large pools apparently without pedestals or statuary within them.[1] Perhaps this is because a life size single sculpture placed on a pedestal in the middle of a large pool might not be visible in detail from the edges. The bronze serpent spout of the Herculaneum palaestra pool, for example, almost 2.5m tall but very slender, was located at the cruciform junction of two intersecting canals, only 5.8m wide, where it could be seen from all angles, close up.[2] Such a piece would have been hard to see if placed in large pools such as that at Oplontis (Fig.125, pool to the left of 92), or the Villa of Quintilius Varus (Fig.126.1). The need for a large, presumably more costly, sculpture for such a centrally placed pedestal was a deterrent to including sculpture within a large pool. The large pools are more likely to have statuary on their edges, or on pedestals projecting into the pool.

Occasionally there are what appear to be bases for statuary or other decorative sculpture projecting into the larger pools – a simple example is provided by the bases

---

[1] Campania: Oplontis (50, perhaps originally longer, x 17m), Villa dei Papiri (c.55 x 7m). Near Tivoli: Villa of Quintilius Varus (62.8 x 24m). Lazio (12km south of Rome): Villa dei Centroni (34 x 11m, Fig.127). Elba: Villa delle Grotte 24 x 13m.
[2] See Maiuri A 1954 passim.

at the short ends of the large pool at the Villa of Quintilius Varus at Tivoli (Fig.126.1); more complex examples include the small peristyle at the Villa dei Papiri where a long thin pool (18 x 1.48m) had 6 semicircular bases, three each long side.[3] There is much dispute about the arrangement of the statuary found in the large peristyle at the Villa dei Papiri around the pool (Fig.124.2)[4] but apparently the pool was flanked fairly closely on its long edges by a rows of double herms including gods, Hellenistic princes and philosophers, and the key figures at either end of the pool were respectively a sleeping and an inebriated satyr, reclining on rocks. Also on the edge, Pan with a goat.[5] There is a great deal more sculpture in the garden of very mixed subject (and no actual fountain statues). At Oplontis there was a similar erotic group (Pan and nymph) at one short end of the pool.[6]

The smaller freestanding pools seem more likely to have some kind of sculpture or simple jets actually in them, as well as by them. For example at the House of the Golden Cupids (VI 16 7) the peristyle pool (dimensions 4 x 7m approximately) had a piped pedestal on the edge and an unpiped pedestal in the middle (whatever was on these pedestals has been lost). Such pedestals or columns in small pools are a fairly common arrangement[7] as are fountain statues on their edges.[8] At the House of the Citharist (I 4 5/25) the arrangement along the edge of a semicircular pool appears to have been (left to right): marble double herm Bacchus/Ariadne; leaping stag; leaping lion (?fountain); group of dog attacking boar, boar (fountain), and dog; serpent (fountain), and finally double herm Bacchus/Ariadne.[9] At Sperlonga it is highly probable that the small rectangular basin on the island triclinium in front of and outside the grotto itself was decorated with a group of satyr children, sitting on the low wall surrounding the basin, and appearing to scoop up and throw its water with their hands

---

[3] Wojcik 1986 212ff suggests these were occupied by the bronze so called dancers (5 found).
[4] Unusually, the 18th century excavation records are fairly clear on find spots, but it is evident that some sculpture shifted during the depositing of the volcanic material, and Wojcik 1986 in particular believes that the Villa was undergoing a major reorganisation at the time of the eruption, so that much sculpture had already out of place.
[5] Wojcik 1986 107f for the Pan with goat, and generally for all finds.
[6] Neudecker 1988 48 and n.458 lists five further versions of this group, none with secure original locations.
[7] For example Pompeii III 2 1, VI 9 2, VI 9 6, VI 12 2-5, VII 4 31/51.
[8] For example Pompei II 2 2 (lower canal), VI 7 23, VI 9 2, IX 8 6. Fountain statue arrangements are also found in Pompeii in gutters for convenient/economic overflow arrangements – the classic example is the House of the Vettii but also at IX 7 20 and VIII 4 4.
[9] Dwyer 1982 89ff. There is also fairly clear information about the arrangement of sculpture on the back edge of the pool at the House of M Lucretius (Dwyer 1982 Figs. 2, 41 and supporting text).

(Fig.124.1).[10] Here, the view from the triclinium has, in the foreground, playful plump satyr children frolicking round a pool, and, in the background, grim Homeric tales of death and blinding. There is ample evidence from Pompeii and Herculaneum of material displayed in and around impluvia which included not just fountain containers or simple jets but also fountain figures of a light hearted or animal nature.[11] Dwyer has observed that the intrusion of 'garden subjects' into the atrium is at odds with its more serious character (as the home for ancestor portraits, domestic shrines, chests containing valuables and so on), yet it happened. [12]

9.1.2 The Villa

No evidence is recorded of pedestals in any of the large pools at the Villa except the Scenic Canal.[13] This is consistent with observations made above about large pools often being empty. The unusual contoured edge around the Peristyle Pool which might possibly have been used to support sculpture is discussed at 5.1.7. Apart from at the Scenic Canal, there is also no clear evidence from the Villa of what might have been displayed in the gardens or other areas immediately surrounding the largest pools.

The possible placement of water containers rather than statuary in the smaller pools is discussed at 8.3.3. Cat.2 C8 discusses the tempting proposition that the dancer statue (Fig.117) was placed in one of the Arcaded Triclinium small pools. The carved waterfowl base also found there is strongly reminiscent of the small animals and beasts found in the gardens, and by the water features of, Pompeii. Cat.2 C15 indicates material from the Bog which had subjects strongly associated with garden or water settings but which cannot be linked with any particular spot in the Villa.

---

[10] Andreae 1976 proposes, Conticello 1976 does not disagree with the general theory, but there is disagreement over the identity of the fourth figure, standing at the back of the pool (see also Riemann 1980 380). The exact find spot of the fragments is not known.
[11] Two examples only: House of Neptune VI 5 3 (Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cat.220) impluvium with Silenus on pedestal and bronze amorini around; House of the Sculptured Capitals (VII 4 57, Andersson 1991 551 n.35) four ducks and one frog, all pierced, found in the impluvium, in addition to a fountain in the form of a lamp.
[12] Dwyer 1982 126. George 1998 sees this phenomenon in the context of a more general invasion of 'atrium' by 'peristyle' but, as indicated above in the text, unusual juxtapositions are not just found in these contexts.
[13] Cat.1 H17 and 9.4.4.

9.2 Contents of niches and other structures

9.2.1 Precedents

While a freestanding pool, however small, represented a more or less blank canvas which sculpture could be placed in or alongside, a niched fountain wall restricted the shape of the sculpture which could be used, if it were to fit in the niche, and favoured frontal compositions. It is very hard to form a view of the assemblages used prior to Hadrian to fill multi-niched fountain structures.[14] To the best of my knowledge, no multi niched fountain structure outside a civic or baths context has come down to us with reliable information about the original display programme[15] and some fairly typical examples of the problems follow. Statuary was found with a fountain wall at Porta San Lorenzo in Rome excavated in the late 19th century. The excavation reports say that one statue was found in situ but not which, of several found.[16]
Notwithstanding Neudecker's description of a reconstructed programme for some kind of fountain structure at the Villa of Cynthia at Tivoli,[17] whether the Nereids concerned came from this villa is uncertain and neither Neuerburg nor Giuliani could actually locate the structure vaguely described.[18] There is partial evidence of the decoration of the so-called Grotto of the Nymph Egeria which is Antonine at latest.[19] This barrel-vaulted room, with three dry niches each side, had a rear extension with a semicircular niche, in which reclined a river god, supported on pilasters. He had a bored vase but the water actually flowed from the pilasters into a basin and then canals along the side walls. A small satyr with a bored vase under his arm was also found in the room, though none of the wall niches were water bearing.

With any assemblage in niches (or indeed around pools), it can be impossible to know when the collection was put together. The evidence from Campania ought to be more

---

[14] Vermeule 1977 does not substantiate his view (27ff) that mirror images and other pairs were especially popular for fountain houses (as compared to other locations) by examples and I am not able to do so.
[15] What happened with ensembles in civic buildings in the eastern Mediterranean, or in baths is not necessarily a guide to what happened elsewhere, and much of the evidence here is later than the Villa. (See Manderscheid 1981 on baths and Gros 1996 424, as a starting point on the 'nymphaea' of Greece and the east).
[16] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.158 with bibliography, plus Jones H S 1912-26 II 81 No. 8.
[17] Neudecker 1998 56.
[18] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.215; Giuliani 1970 No. 212.
[19] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.81, Neudecker 1988 Cat.37.16, and 17; Tobin 1997 369ff.

reliable in this respect since assemblages cannot postdate 79AD[20] but the information about the limited number of multiple niche fountain structures from Pompeii is sadly incomplete. At the House of the Bull, all three niches had water but there is no information about their contents (V 1 7); two of three niches had water at the House of the Black Anchor (VI 10 7), no information about contents.[21]

There is rather more information about the 20 or so single niche fountains or fountain rooms in Pompeii, mostly with mosaic decoration. Several possibly did not originally contain statuary since they had water steps starting at the top of the back of the niche.[22] The central figures surviving from the others are 3 Sileni,[23] one Mars, and one Pomona[24] - all statuettes, rather than full size works. More complex arrangements survive at VII 4 56 where in addition to the Silenus figure, there are fountain rabbits perched on the dividing walls of the three-part pool at the bottom. At VII 8 23 where there is a mask of Silenus as jet, the lower pool was decorated with a putto with duck, a fisherman (both bronze) and a sleeping boy. The general trend here then is toward Dionysiac and playful subjects.

In this desert of information the recent discovery of part of the statuary in situ in a niched fountain room at Punta Epitaffio, Baiae is of great interest.[25] The room is a vaulted apsed rectangular hall 18 x 9.5m with four rectangular niches each side. A canal runs between walls and the U shaped dining bank, there would have been a pool filling the centre with seawater.[26] Fig.128 shows the find spots of statuary. The extant statuary comprises, in the rocky cavity at the rear, on the left Odysseus offering a cup of wine (fountain statue) and on the right, a companion with a wineskin (fountain statue). This scene was evidently the inebriation of Polyphemus. In the left hand

---

[20] Bartmann 1991 72 (judging from this page and the material she uses in her very thoughtful article) has been substantially deterred from using the Pompeian evidence for the location and arrangement of the contents of sculpture collections. In particular the tendency to reuse statuary which she notes (there is no evidence that every single piece was reused) is not a 'Pompeii' phenomenon but one which she notes herself in various locations throughout her article. Obviously we cannot assume that any context at Pompeii was either sealed, preserved entirely, or complete at the point of sealing but with these and other provisos there is a lot to be learned from the Campanian displays.

[21] The niches at the House of Camillus VII 12 23 did not have water.

[22] The recently excavated VI 17 Ins Occ 14; VIII 2 28; II 7 1 (House of Julia Felix).

[23] VII 4 56, IX 2 5, IX 7 25.

[24] VI 14 43, I 7 10/12.

[25] Underwater now, perhaps only accessible by boat in antiquity. The key document is still Sciarelli 1983, but Andreae 1996 316ff, Andreae 1999 224ff are also useful.

[26] It has also been suggested that water may have dripped down the walls beneath the niches – there are pipe impressions on the east wall (Sciarelli 1983 33 and Fig.19). There are also indications of pipework at the rear of the apse, around the Polyphemus location (Sciarelli 1983 33); see Fig.128 for the position of fistulae.

niches (looking into the room from the entrance) Antonia, mother of Claudius, with divine attributes, and from the niches on the right hand side a statue of Dionysus with panther, another of Dionysus with crown of ivy, and a draped girl child. There are fragments of other sculpture. Judging by these fragments, the other statuary, including the Polyphemus from the rear group, had been carefully removed in antiquity.[27] The identity of the child and the other missing subjects represented in the side niches is not agreed.[28]

The statuary in the small gardens and water features of Pompeii is often less than life size and little evidence has survived from elsewhere of statuary significantly larger than life size in association with water features or of niches large enough to contain them.

9.2.2 The Villa

The Villa does not differ from any other villa in that it is impossible to identify the subjects of the standing statues which occupied most niche fountains. In the Water Court main building there are hints of a homogeneous programme of 'typical' subjects (Cat.2 C10) with figures of nymphs and Aphrodite (and a frieze showing playful marine and hunting scenes). Cat.2 C4 and C12 discuss inconclusive evidence relating to the East Belvedere and the Upper Park Wall.

In the Arcaded Triclinium two Athenas probably formed part of the sculptures (twelve bases) surrounding the large block fountain. There is not a shred of direct archaeological evidence from the Villa, of what, if anything, occupied spaces available in the cavea fountain in the Residence, or of what stood on the pedestals in the alcove basins of the fountain wall adjoining the Small Baths,[29] and so on.

---

[27] Before the room flooded completely – a fifth century amphora burial in the apse shows the room was still accessible at that point.

[28] Andreae in Sciarelli 1983 has reconstructed a dynastic programme in the niches (by inference installed by Claudius) consisting of Augustus and Livia, Antonia and Drusus, the two children of Claudius and the two figures of Dionysus whom he perceives as tutelary deity of the children as well as a link to the inebriation scene (Andreae 1999 240). In fact Dionysus has a much stronger link with dining and drinking than tutelary function; and the only certainly identified other figure is Antonia. Zevi (in Andreae 1996 318) does not support Andreae's proposal.

[29] Although in this case the remains of sub-pedestals alongside the main central pedestals in the alcoves does suggest two or more figures, or complex figures, in each alcove requiring more than one support – Cat.1 H13.

Various suggestions have been made about the location of the Niobid group, fragments of which were found in the Stadium Garden (Fig.118, Cat.2 C9). If we assume that this was set in a large, open space, in the Stadium Garden (the absence of a roof being desirable for the dramatic appeal of this group), given the size of the group, the only realistic location is that proposed by Hoffmann in the courtyard at the centre of the Garden (Fig.55 15).[30] There are 4 statue pedestals on the east side of the court – possibly for subject matter complementary to the central group though they would not be visible from the key rooms on the east side.

A suggestion by Geominy[31] that the group was somehow set into the south basin area (Fig.55 19-21) of the Garden is, in my view, improbable. One of his objections to the central court position is that the rear parts of the surviving pieces, like the Florentine Niobid group, have not been fully worked, and therefore were not intended to be seen in the round. I think given the highly fragmentary nature of the Villa pieces and the complete lack of information about how they were grouped, this point is not conclusive.[32] The only large flat surface in this area is the walkway running between the edge of the cavea element and the semicircular pools.[33] It is hard to imagine a satisfactory arrangement of the group in this location. The raised roof of the grotto occupies the mid point behind the pool and would it into left and right halves. These Niobid groups included figures in many different positions and registers and the Villa group in particular contained completely supine figures best seen from above, whereas here they could only be seen from a slightly lower level, the walkway being slightly higher than the floor level of the north sector. A group of this size and complexity was ideally suited to the large open space at the centre of the Garden rather than the confined and narrow spaces available in the south basin, and the best view would be from the dining area in the Peristyle Pool Building – Fig.61.2 (the group would occupy the area of grass and rubble).

This conclusion means, in effect, that although this group had an important role to play in the overall design and impact of the Stadium Garden especially as it interacted with

---

[30] Hoffmann 1980 76. Hoffmann believes at the same time that this area was also covered with shallow water – see Cat.1 H12 – not a belief I share

[31] Geominy 1990 380.

[32] And Adriano 2000 Cat.42 says contrarily that the Villa examples were worked relatively carefully at the back; clearly this is a matter of opinion.

[33] There is no evidence of pedestals in the pool.

the axial views, it was not actually used in the water features of the Garden.[34] This is consistent with the display of the Niobid group in the Horti Sallustiani, which may also have been set up by Hadrian.[35] There is a possibility that a Niobid group existed at Nero's villa at Subiaco.[36]

The scale of some features at the Villas suggests they contained colossal figures (or groups). The niche in the East Belvedere (Cat.1 H3, Fig.28.4) is 3.5m wide and 5m high, the niche at the end of the rear extension of the Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H17, Fig.90) is 2.4 x 4m. Colossal fragments extant include a head of Hercules originally belonging to a statue[37] and an unpublished fragment of a colossal portrait statue in the storerooms of the Villa.[38]

9.3 Contents of grottoes

9.3.1 Precedents

The evidence relating to programmes used to decorate grottoes, is listed here in what appears to be their order of date. The Grotta Azzurra in Capri, accessible by boat and maybe in ancient times by a passage from the villa above,[39] contained niches at ancient water level in which statues were fixed. The fragments recovered include a Neptune, two Tritons and a female draped statue.[40]

At Sperlonga[41] the decorative programme of the grotto (Fig.124.1) included the Scylla group on its pedestal in the main pool, with (in one interpretation) Odysseus

---

[34] Lavagne 1988 602-603 sees Niobid groups as having a more regular connection with grottoes – he cites the Horti Lamiani/Florentine group, but this post-dates the Villa, and so far as I am aware, there is no grotto link. He also cites Pausanias I 21 3 for a Niobid group in a cave at the top of the theatre of Dionysus in Athens – however the text is not clear as to whether this depiction was a tripod relief, or in the cave, or both (cf Hitzig and Blümner 1896 236). I think he overstates any relationship between the very small grotto at the south end of the Stadium Garden and a large group in the middle in the open air.

[35] See references in Cat.2 C9. A single Niobid figure is also associated with the Villa (Raeder 1983 III 85).

[36] Neudecker 1988 Cat.63.1 and MNR 1/1 No. 114.

[37] Raeder 1983 I 11, found in the Bog, perhaps to be matched with the (lost) colossal Hercules fragment found near the East Belvedere (here Cat.2 C4).

[38] Raeder 1983 291.

[39] Lavagne 1988 566; Andrén 1980 82 disagrees because of bad air in the passage, but maybe the bad air is caused by the blockage.

[40] Neudecker 1988 Cat.5.

[41] There has been a great deal of debate about the date of the decoration and elaboration of Sperlonga but for these purposes it is sufficient to note that it certainly pre-dated Hadrian's Villa, though statuary additions continued to be made up to the time of the tetrarchs (Neudecker 1988 Cat.62.17).

recovering the body of Achilles on a spur to the left (a variation on the 'Pasquino' Menelaos/Patroclus group),[42] the theft of the Palladion on the right, behind, a massive group depicting the blinding of Polyphemus and perhaps in the smaller left hand rear grotto, another Odyssean group featuring Philoctetes.[43] Unfortunately the published information about other finds in the grotto is far from clear,[44] but if we assume that all the apparently pre-Hadrianic sculpture found there originated from it, then homes within the area of the grotto also have to be found for satyr children, a putto fountain, a Silenus representation, a child with a Silenus mask, a statue of Athena, a draped statue of a girl and at least two herms.[45] A Ganymede stood above the entrance to the cave. At Punta Epitaffio the rocky cavity at the rear of the fountain room contained a representation of the inebriation of Polyphemus (see 9.2.1 above) but also other kinds of material.

Finally[46] the so-called Ninfeo Bergantino at Castel Gandolfo whose structural resemblance, scaled down, to Sperlonga has been well noted (Fig.129). Finds include fragments belonging to a Polyphemus group,[47] a Scylla group, again resting on an island in the water,[48] and a Ganymede.[49] But there are also 13 niches to be filled and other finds attributed to the grotto itself include a Hercules or giant in high relief, a life size horse, two wings probably from an Eros, various portions of male statues and a satyr.[50]

9.3.2 The Villa

The extent to which grottoes existed structurally at the Villa is discussed at 4.1.5 where I suggest the only structure which is architecturally comparable to Sperlonga, Punta

---

[42] There is still far from universal agreement on who and what these fragments represent – for recent discussion see contributions by H A Weis and P Green in Grummond and Ridgway 2000, at 117ff and 180ff.
[43] Andreae 1999 185f.
[44] The key information is Iacopi G 1963 109ff.
[45] Neudecker 1988 Cat.62.11 (3 counted as one), 12, 9, 10, 7, 6, 13 and 14.
[46] Lavagne 1988 579ff, and others, include Room 45 (Fig.138) in the Domus Aurea in this grotto series on the basis of a precious but isolated ceiling mosaic showing Odysseus and Polyphemus. This seems unlikely, to me, to have been the most important decorative feature of the room, which otherwise is a fountain room rather than a grotto (4.2.3). We know nothing of the subjects of other, missing, ceiling emblemata nor of the sculpture which must have been placed in the niches of the room, nor what was depicted on the wall at the top of the water steps, all of which might give the room a quite different feel.
[47] Neudecker 1988 Cat.9.4, 9.5.
[48] Neudecker 1988 Cat.9.9, 9.10.
[49] Neudecker 1988 Cat.9.7.
[50] Neudecker 1988 Cat.9.6, 8, 11, mentioned between 11 and 12, 12.

Epitaffio and Castel Gandolfo is the Park Grotto (Cat.1 H20) - compare Fig.95.3 and 124.1 for example.

Three heads from a group representing the blinding of Polyphemus by Odysseus and his companions, and also fragments of two Pasquino groups (also represented at Sperlonga) have been recovered from the Villa.[51] There is no archaeological indication of their original location. 9.4.3 below explains why I find suggestions that the Villa Polyphemus group was set up in the Scenic Triclinium unsatisfactory, but the Park Grotto is a possibility.

Though only excavation will establish the features of the floor of the feature, it is possible on basis of the current evidence that the Polyphemus group was set out in the dripping and artificially embellished cave roughly 6m wide, a perfect size for a Sperlonga-size group. The Sperlonga group comprised Odysseus, three companions, and Polyphemus and as restored measures 6 x 3.5m. The Villa heads are to the same scale[52]– and since there are three companion heads, the Villa group probably contained the same number of figures, or more.

The cave may have been separated from the viewers by a pool but with the curving side tunnels giving access close to the group. A long valley, cut into the rock, approached the Grotto but it was also accessible from the underground road which ran along the east edge of the Villa. Covered summer dining arrangements might have been set up in front of the grotto itself, provided that valley was not (as discussed in the Catalogue entry) filled with water.

9.4 Grouping of statuary

9.4.1 Precedents

Groups appear in Roman structures as collections of related but different figures representing an episode from a story. Scylla groups, Polyphemus groups and Niobid groups have already been mentioned. Amazons are another example.[53]

---

[51] See Cat.2 C15.
[52] Compared by Conticello and Andreae 1974 66.
[53] Anzio group Neudecker 1988 Cat.2.16 and 2.1

Groups also occur where pieces are displayed together taking into account symmetry and balance, particularly in subject. Pendants, whether complementary, reversed, or straight copies, had a role in this. The grouping or posing of complementary pieces is evident for example in the House of the Stags where the arrangement in the garden apparently consisted of a pair of stag and dog groups side by side (similar but not exact copies); followed by a pair of round tables; followed by a pair of statues consisting of Hercules urinating and a satyr with a wineskin on his shoulder. The last pair are complementary in their playful subject matter (and allusion to drinking), size, and pose (lurching, hips thrust forward). The satyr is a fountain statue and a basin was placed in front to catch the jet from the wineskin, though no plumbing was recorded.[54] There were 6 pairs in the atrium of the Villa dei Papiri and a further group of 4 putti with variations was found in a room at the far end of the main peristyle, none of these necessarily in their intended display spot.[55] Other examples or pairs and groupings might be taken from the garden of the House of M Lucretius (IX 2 5) or the miniature statuary flanking the upper canal at the House of Loreius Tiburtinus (II 2 2).[56]

The statuary from the larger villas has almost all lost its original detailed context but examples of pairs and larger groupings include:

- Formia – pair of Nereids on hippocamps (adapted as fountain figures)[57]
- Castel Gandolfo – four wine pouring satyrs[58]
- Three examples of boy with goose (fountain figures) from the Villa of the Quintili near Rome[59]
- Dog pairs and single figures from a villa at Lanuvium[60]
- Egyptian subjects from the Villa of Cassius at Tivoli.[61]

---

[54] Herculaneum IV 21, see Tran 1988 98ff.
[55] Though these were fountain statuettes, there is no evidence of a pool in this location despite Bartmann 1988 220 and n.47.
[56] Jashemski 1979-1993 II Cats. 479 and 135.
[57] See Lattimore 1976 51f for bibliography. Note that although Maiuri B 1957 25 confidently states that they were displayed by a piscina, there are no excavation records and the only source for this information is Aurigemma and De Santis 1955 34 where it is said that they were found in 'un'antica piscina' - an ambivalent term.
[58] Neudecker 1988 Cat.9.2.
[59] Neudecker 1988 Cat.39.19.
[60] Neudecker 1988 Cat.21.1-4, 21.23-25.
[61] Neudecker 1988 Cat.66.

An assemblage from Via Cavour,[62] though not from a water context, illustrates though that sculpture set side by side for display is not necessarily predictable either iconographically or stylistically. The statuary consisted of a general and a satyr either side of a doorway leading to a room where two statues of Pothos (Desire) flank the next doorway. There is no obvious iconographic or other link between general and satyr. The two versions of Pothos are not mirror images; they are different versions of the same pose, differing in date.[63] Bartmann makes various observations on the aesthetics of the poses of the four figures, nonetheless, I do not think that if one or two of them happened to be missing, there is any way that one could guess accurately what the missing item(s) was or were. If the general were missing, one might guess another Dionysiac subject to pair the satyr; if a Pothos was missing one might naturally suppose another – but as mirror, not as replica.

9.4.2 The Villa - general

The size of the Villa and the resources at Hadrian's disposal might lead one to expect that at some point(s) in the Villa there would be several multiple figure groups and we do know of several. The Niobid group from the Stadium Garden is discussed above as is the Polyphemus group. The Scylla group fragments found in the Scenic Canal are discussed in detail below. There were two Pasquino groups (Cat.2 C15) and other two-figure sculpture.

It is apparent from the extant material that pairs played a part in Villa water feature decoration too. The clearest examples are the river gods found in the Scenic Canal (discussed below together with other pairings from the Canal), and the centaurs from the Reverse Curve Pavilion (Cat.2 C14). There are other repeated or complementary figures but no evidence that they were displayed together.[64]

---

[62] As the arrangement is reconstructed by Bartmann 1988. The date at which the assemblage was put together is not known.
[63] Another interesting possible same subject pair - this time of Meleagers – comes from the Villa at Santa Marinella (Neudecker 1988 Cat.58 1-2) – but how they were displayed in relation to each other is not clear.
[64] Raeder 1983 n.226 gives a list of apparent pairs regardless of find spot. This includes two red fauns (Raeder I 48 and I 125) which taken out of context look like a pair matched for display, but their separate and distant find spots make this unlikely (Cat.2 C6 and C14).

9.4.3 The Villa – the Scenic Triclinium

Cat.2 C11 explains that there is no sure archaeological evidence of what occupied the niches to the rear of the stibadium, the niches lining the walls of the rear extension, the rear niche, the platform (if anything) and the apsed niches of the side pavilions (Fig.81). All the complex theories which have been advanced for the decoration of this part of the complex are essentially speculative. The only certain indication as to the decorative themes of the Triclinium comes from the fragments of both white and black friezes found in the area.[65] Their precise original location is not known but they must have come from some part(s) of the Triclinium and their subject is amorini in a marine setting.

Grenier 1989 proposes that the six Egyptianising statues found by the Jesuits east of the Canal, plus other sculpture with an Egyptian subject, some with a Villa provenance, occupied the Scenic Triclinium and that the whole assemblage had a cult significance.[66] Andreae accepts Grenier's proposal but suggests that prior to the Egyptian installation, which was contingent on the death of Antinous in 130AD, the Villa Polyphemus group (Fig.81.1) occupied the platform.[67] Salza Prina Ricotti thinks since the Scenic Triclinium is a dining area there is no question of an Egyptian cult theme. She believes the Polyphemus group was in the rear niche and that the platform itself was used not for dining (or at least not in Hadrian's day) but for an ostentatious display of precious goods inspired by the examples of Ptolemy Philadelphus and Nero (presumably not so as to obscure the view of the Polyphemus group though).[68]

Grenier's theory relies on Jesuit finds not from the Triclinium but from the garden area, on these having originated from the Triclinium, and on adding sculpture which

---

[65] See 8.1.2 n.29.
[66] This proposal is reflected, without any discussion of its hypothetical nature, in the present display in Room III of the Museo Gregoriano Egizio at the Vatican. See 7.5.1 for an assessment of the likelihood of the Scenic Triclinium and Canal having a specific Egyptian or cult link.
[67] Andreae 1996 342, preceding bibliography given. Andreae 1982 222 previously proposed the Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium as a location (Cat.1 H18) but his own excavations (Andreae and Ortega 1989) in effect eliminated this possibility by establishing that the room was enclosed and, that there is not enough room inside for a group of this size, and people too.
[68] Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 254ff with previous bibliography.

has no connection to the Villa, resulting in a scenario which is based entirely on hypothesis.[69]

It seems very unlikely that the Polyphemus group was displayed in the rear niche as Salza Prina Ricotti suggests. The niche is narrow (2.4m) and tall (4m). The sculptural blinding/inebriation groups are wide and low (Fig.124.1), and at Sperlonga, Punta Epitaffio and Castel Gandolfo they were displayed in wide, low settings. Moreover the Villa group appears to have comprised the same number of pieces as the Sperlonga group, to the same scale (9.3.2). As restored the Sperlonga group is 6m wide and 3.5m high. It is impossible to fit a group this size in the rear niche. Salza Prina Ricotti's illustrations show the Polyphemus only,[70] implying that the figures of the companions were displayed with another Polyphemus elsewhere in the Villa, or don't come from the Villa at all. It is more straightforward to conclude there was only one group, and it would not fit in the Scenic Triclinium niche.

As for Andreae's suggestion that the Polyphemus group occupied the platform,[71] and Salza Prina Ricotti's that the platform was used for the display of other objects, it is clear structurally that the platform bridge is a secondary installation which altered the dynamics of the rear extension. However a simpler explanation of its installation is that it was a dining platform. The view from this platform was arguably an improvement on the view from the stibadium, combining architecture and vista (compare Fig.85.2 and 85.3). Whoever dined up here was both elevated above and detached from all the diners at ground level and in short it appears to be an ideal dining position for the Emperor when entertaining, rather than a display platform.

Since the whole area of the Scenic Triclinium has now been completely cleared and no fragments of statuary have been found, it seems that we are never going to know for certain what the subjects of the statuary arranged in its many spaces were.

---

[69] There are strong iconographical objections to the proposed groupings in Grenier 1989 (conversation with Dr. Sally-Ann Ashton of the Fitzwilliam Museum). Tiberi 1957 and 1959 advances another hypothesis, which has found no later support, and is based on very slender evidence.
[70] Salza Prina Ricotti 1998 382 and Fig 12 for example.
[71] Andreae 1999 317 says the Scenic Triclinium is the only place in the Villa where the Polyphemus group could have been displayed, but this is patently not true.

9.4.4 The Villa – the Scenic Canal Scylla group

The discovery in the 1950s of numerous fragments of a Scylla group in the Canal is described at Cat.2 C11. Many of these, but not all of them, as discussed below, were found around the south pedestal in the Canal. Fig.119 shows a reconstruction of the original appearance of the group. As is usual with reconstructions, the authors have used other Scylla fragments as models, to fill in the gaps.[72] However in this case, fragments which have no Villa provenance are not just used as models. Andreae proposes that these fragments came from the Villa originally, have lost their provenance, and that because of the quantity and duplication of fragments, when grouped with the Villa fragments, there must have been two groups, one placed on each of the two pedestals in the Canal.[73]

Manderscheid 2000a has recently objected to the two group hypothesis, for two reasons. First, although material was found near the north pedestal as well as the south, an alternative explanation is not that there were two groups but that the south group might have been partly moved along the Canal from the south, and then broken; Manderscheid also notes that there is no fragment at all of any second hemisphere support.[74] Additional objections to Andreae's hypothesis are as follows:

1. Nowhere does he enumerate and describe explicitly all the fragments found in the Canal and attributed to the group(s).[75] His arguments are not always easy to follow but I believe he does not specify any duplication of fragments *from the 1950s excavations* (my emphasis),[76] which would be very important substantiation of his two-group claim. The duplication appears to arise from the inclusion of the fragments not found in the 1950s at the Villa (the added fragments).

---

[72] See Waywell 1997 for the development of ancient Scylla models, with comprehensive earlier bibliography.
[73] The argument for there being two groups, not one with fragments scattered all over the Canal, is set out in 1982 by Andreae 1982 226ff (and in Andreae 1983, the Italian translation, 178ff). By 1996 (Andreae 1996 344 inner side), the hypothesis that some of the fragments in museums without provenance might have come from the Villa is being represented as fact – and as Manderscheid 2000a n.110 points out, accepted without query by a number of other authors.
[74] Manderscheid 2000a 127.
[75] Aurigemma describes some fragments at Aurigemma 1956 57-61; Andreae 1996 Cat 5.23 lists 104 fragments, without find spots. Andreae's list is considerably more extensive; Aurigemma apparently only describes the more recognisable fragments.
[76] Though Aurigemma 1956 Fig. 7 and 8 look very similar from the photographs.

2. There is an alternative provenance for some of the added fragments.[77]
3. There is unresolved disagreement about whether the marble of the added fragments is the same as the marble of the Villa fragments.[78]
4. Although Aurigemma, the excavator, did not leave records of find spots for all the fragments, he did stress (Aurigemma 1956 60) that they were found all over the Canal and at different levels (for example one companion torso was found almost 50m from either pedestal and 50cm from the bottom of the canal (Aurigemma 1956 59). This scattering, but with a concentration of important fragments round the south pedestal, is consistent with a single group there, initially smashed and scattered widely and then further scattered by more destruction and digging (as implied by Manderscheid 2000a), rather than with two groups.
5. Finally the Villa dog heads and the added Vatican dog heads are very different in style.[79]

The sensible conjecture in Manderscheid 2000a that at one time a piped water supply was at least planned for the two pedestals neither advances nor militates against the two group argument since there is no evidence from any fragment of a piped supply to any part of the group.[80]

It seems probable to me that the added fragments, scattered over several museums, with no Villa connection, which have been used in the Villa Scylla reconstruction, come from one or more different groups which are in addition to the Scylla groups we have so far been able to link with a location. Thus at the Villa there was only one Scylla group, on the south pedestal, and no clear information about what was on the north – maybe the crocodile (see Cat.2 B4), maybe something else removed in antiquity and now totally disappeared, maybe a simple fountain spout (see Cat.1 H17), or maybe nothing was ever put there in the end.

---

[77] De Lachenal 1976 has proposed a group from Anzio, linking the Torlonia (previously Albani) torso and the Vatican fragments. The Anzio provenance for the torso is dubious for reasons given by Schreiber 1879 No. 165 – but if the torso did not come from Anzio, that does not mean it came from Hadrian's Villa.
[78] Andreae has not dealt with observations by Liverani 1989 88 n.98 and also *RendPontAcc* 61 (1988/89) 120 that the Vatican marble is not pavonazzetto, as the Villa fragments are. De Lachenal 1976 thinks the Vatican fragments and the Torlonia torso use the same marble. The Berlin fragments are described as white.
[79] De Lachenal 1976.
[80] See Cat.1 H17.

9.4.5 The Villa – the other sculpture from the Scenic Canal

The discovery in the 1950s of fragments of a wide range of other sculpture in the Canal is described at Cat.2 C11. The subjects have suggested a number of different interpretations which are sensibly summarised by Raeder 1983.[81] All interpretations rest on an assumption that the subjects and arrangement were as originally chosen by Hadrian, and were not the result of a later remodelling of the area. We cannot of course be sure of this although though there is no suggestion that the sculpture discussed here was carved later than Hadrian.[82]

Raeder's own proposal is to understand the Sileni, the Caryatids, and the other subjects arranged around the north end of the Canal as having a political message which would be understood by the sophisticated guests attending Hadrian's banquets, well versed in the images of imperial propaganda. It seems to me that the arrangement of the sculpture at the north end of the Canal strongly suggests it was intended to be viewed together – three pendant pairs – two Amazons, Hermes and Ares, Nile and Tiber.[83] Raeder's suggestion of a message of peace and plenty through strength and virtue may well be a sound understanding of the intent here.

I am less convinced this north end sculpture was intended to be read with the Sileni and Caryatids from the west bank, from which it was rather distant physically and maybe separated by other, different sculpture, now lost. The Sileni and Caryatids together may instead be taken as representations of different types of servants to the gods. The Caryatids are obviously also a strong reference to Athens and the closest analogies to the Sileni are from the Theatre of Dionysus there. Caryatid supports also feature in theatre decoration.[84] Ideally we should also know what was either side of the Sileni, and on the opposite bank to this group, though the framing of the four Caryatids by the Sileni strongly suggests that this was a closed and discrete group.

---

[81] At 300ff, with the addition of a failed attempt by Hannestad 1982 (not apparently seen by Raeder 1983) to establish (through excavation) a monument to Antinous as part of the decorative ensemble. See also Lavagne 1988 603ff.

[82] A head of Julia Domna (Aurigemma 1956 62) clearly does postdate Hadrian

[83] Assuming this set is complete – there is not enough of it to provide one statue per intercolumniation – but on the other hand if it is not complete, statuary must have been removed in such a way as to leave pairs.

[84] Adriano 2000 Cat.38-39 for a summary of various Caryatid/Sileni connections.

The sculpture found also includes substantial parts of a crocodile, an Athena, and a satyr, and a host of other fragments scattered in the infill of the Canal – fragments of wings, panther heads and so on – which may have formed part of the decoration on the edge of the Canal originally. The satyr is a member of Dionysus' retinue and is frequently displayed in a garden setting; the panther is a Dionysian animal. The Athena could signify any number of things including Athens, as the crocodile could Egypt – and some have seen the Canal sculpture as a microcosm of Hadrian's travels.[85] The crocodile and other Egyptian motifs figure repeatedly in Roman decoration from small private dwellings to large public monuments, and not necessarily in a political context.

There is a strong possibility that fluvial or marine representations in addition to the Nile and Tiber were arranged round the Canal. Apart from the substantially preserved Nile and Tiber a fluvial head was found on the west side, north end, and a plinth on the east side, north end.[86] The head is sometimes assumed to be Oceanus but it is really too battered to tell.[87] The find spot of cornucopia fragments is not given.[88] Reclining fluvial deities do not have to be displayed in pairs[89] though possibly it is more likely that they were, around the Canal, since the display is strongly symmetrical. Oceanus, rather than a river god, might play a part in Raeder's political theme, symbolising Rome's hegemony over all the oceans of the world. We know too that fluvial/marine deities were represented too in old/young pairs and that is another possibility suggested by the Canal fragments.[90] The attribution of three reclining water deities to Domitian's villa at Castel Gandolfo – although it would be very interesting as a parallel for the Villa - is very uncertain.[91]

---

[85] Kapossy 1967 40ff.
[86] Both Aurigemma 1956 64
[87] Another head of a fluvial or marine deity (bust modern) from the Bog is now in the Vatican (Spinola 2000 88 No. 42 – Raeder 1983 I 119 does not take as fluvial, but I think he is mistaken here). It is rather different to the Nile/Tiber pair. There is another cornucopia allegedly from the Villa (Sir John Soane Museum No. 924 = Vermeule 1973 II No.393). Although this is much the same size as the Canal finds, there are stylistic differences (for example the Canal horns appear much more simply decorated), and the Soane cornucopia seems designed for an upright, not a reclining statue.
[88] Aurigemma 1956 65.
[89] Klementa 1993 221ff and see Grotto of the Nymph Egeria at 9.2.1.
[90] In Villa Albani, a pair of colossal heads (Bol 1989-98 V Cat. 925 and 926; it is not clear whether they were spouts). Now in the Naples Museum, originally from the Iseum Campense, a pair of reclining Oceani, one with a cornucopia, the other an oar (Klementa 1993 Cat. C4/5 – where they are described as pendant variants, it seems to me that age is definitely one of the intended points of contrast – see especially Taf. 27).
[91] Volpi reported a Nile and two river gods from Castel Gandolfo, see Lugli 1920 18ff Nos. 60-62. No. 61 appears to be a statue now in Museo Torlonia (Klementa 1993 Cat.A5). Klementa 1993 Cat C1 suggests the Oceanus now in the Cortile della Pigna in the Vatican is Lugli No. 60. Neudecker 1988

Recently attention has been drawn to a similar 'set' of Nile, Tiber, Oceanus (two) and a crocodile from the area of the Iseum on the Campus Martius. The Villa Nile and Tiber particularly are seen as scaled down and simplified copies.[92] The analogy should not be pushed too far - there was a great deal of other sculpture around the Iseum too, and the two Oceanus representations surviving are late second century.[93] Nonetheless the Nile and Tiber at the Iseum appear to have been located in or near the edge of a semicircular basin and the crocodile, perhaps, by a canal.[94] The setting of Nile, Tiber and crocodile close to each other at the Villa might recall the religious area of the Iseum, and the sacred nature of water in the cult but the foregoing discussion makes it clear that this would be just one of a series of references and allusions.

9.5 Arrangement of statuary for views

9.5.1 Precedents

It is clear that many statues were set up around water features with a particular view in mind, and this might be the view from the main doorway (especially evident in the smaller houses of Pompeii),[95] or from a dining area – as for example the view from the dining island at Sperlonga into the grotto (Fig.124.1).[96] Large areas like that surrounding large pools at the Villa dei Papiri (9.1.1) gave scope for setting up large quantities of material which would be seen in different juxtapositions and from different angles by people walking in the garden or in the structures around it.

9.5.2 The Villa

The occurrence at the Villa of long axial views passing through planes established by walls, doorways, windows and columnar screens to a terminal point is discussed in

---

Cat.9 n.21 however observes that Volpi only talks generally about the ruins of ancient Albanum as find spot and the existence of the statues at Villa Barberini is not evidence that they came from the area actually occupied by Domitian's Villa. Klementa's evidence for the Oceanus/Domitian's Villa link is Nibby 1827, who is unlikely to have had any new accurate information about the provenance.

[92] Thinking summarised at Adriano 2000 Cat. 32/33.

[93] Klementa 1993 Cat.C4 and C5 and Lembke 1994 Cat E3 and 4.

[94] Lembke 1984 18 for river gods and Cat.39 for crocodile.

[95] Examples of the prominent display of bronze statuettes at Pompeii Dwyer 1991 n.54.

[96] Examples from Campania: the view from the biclinium down the canal at the House of Loreius Tiburtinus with statuary either side (II 2 2); at Oplontis the view of the pool from room 69 is improved by a wider intercolumniation (De Caro 1987 85) and here Fig.125.

connection with the large complex water features at the introduction to Chapter 7. The length of these views, around 100m, would mean that any statuary used at the terminus would not be seen particularly clearly, though it would be seen. At the Island Enclosure, for example, the axial view terminated at the one end in a fountain wall with niches (Cat.1 H5) and at the other in a large alcove probably intended for a sculpture (Fig.33). There are smaller examples of views intersected by planes – for example the view of the four corner fountains of the Water Court (6.3.3). My proposal for the location of the Villa Polyphemus group (9.3.2) puts it at the terminus of the long straight approach valley to the Park Grotto.

If I am correct in thinking that the Niobid group found in the Stadium Garden was set up in the central open court (Fig.55 15), as discussed at 9.4.2, it had an interesting role to play in the views. This open court, about 20m square, is at the point where the axial line of view (Fig.47.2) running west to east all the way from the entry point of the Arcaded Triclinium, through to the rooms at the lowest level of the Peristyle Pool Building, crosses the long axis of the Garden itself. The main room of the Peristyle Pool Building group, which is at a slightly higher level than the Garden, would enjoy a superb view of the group (Fig.61.2). Finally, the north south axial view of the Stadium Garden crossed the court (Fig.56.2, though the group is not shown).

The extensive finds from the Scenic Canal and the survival of the structure provide evidence equal to or better than that from other locations like the Villa dei Papiri for viewpoints. The design permitted a wide range of viewpoints. The occupants of the platform or stibadium would see what was on the pedestals in the Canal surrounded by the sculpture set on the edge of the Canal (Figs.85.2 and 85.3). The view from the north end is shown at Fig.83.1, again incorporating pedestal material, Canal side material, and perhaps very distantly whatever was in the rear niche of the Scenic Triclinium. A person walking round the Canal would see the statuary on the opposite bank through the gaps in the statuary and columns on the near bank. So far as we can tell, the statues themselves had their backs to the paths, facing the water.[97] Someone floating in the water or in a boat would see statuary on the pedestals or on the bank closer. The whole ensemble would also be visible in different perspectives from the

[97] It is curious though that the backs of the statue plinths at the north end were apparently not worked (Raeder 1983 242) – though the statues themselves appear fully finished.

upper terraces to the east, the upper levels behind the Triclinium, and the buildings set back from the west bank.

Conclusions

The extant fountain figures from the Villa (one draped male, one crocodile, one colossal head of Oceanus and a Nile) do not in any way reflect the distribution of subject matter in fountain figures found by Kapossy (as outlined in 3.4), where nymphs/Aphrodite and satyr figures and children form a majority. However the small number of piped examples as compared to the number of potential locations – over 40 as a conservative estimate - from the Villa suggests the surviving material may not be a representative sample and there certainly is non fountain material from the Villa representing these subjects and also much material with subjects generally found in gardens.[98] The review above of the statuary associated with water features at the Villa, fountain and non fountain, the precedents, coupled with the existing research outlined at 3.4 leads to some broader conclusions about the use of statuary with water features at the Villa and its ancient Italian context.

The large pools at the Villa conform to the previous pattern in that (with the exception of the Scenic Canal) they were empty of statuary. The extensive evidence for the material around the Canal also conforms to previous patterns in that there is a mixture of subjects. In this case, taking into account what is known of the character and position of the owner,[99] the choice of subjects is at least partly determined by political or policy messages – but probably only partly determined, because other material in the Canal hints at more playful garden subjects nearby. The very fragmentary evidence for the Water Court sculpture subjects appears at first glance to reflect a popular taste for Aphrodite and nymph representations as fountain figure or figure subjects. However, bearing in mind the juxtaposition in niches at Punta Epitaffio of statues of Dionysus and contemporary portraits, the full original programme of the Water Court may have been a broader mixture. The same breadth of subject matter of a full water feature sculptural programme is demonstrated in the grottoes as well. The juxtaposition of serious and lighter material is not then just a feature of imitative displays cobbled

---

[98] Raeder 369ff is a convenient list of all sculpture reliably linked with the Villa by find spot. Cat.2 C here lists all the sculpture which can be linked with water features at the Villa.
[99] Whereas the owner of the Villa dei Papiri chose Hellenistic princes and philosophers, inter alia, for his pool garden.

together by people who did not necessarily understand what they were doing, as suggested by Zanker (see 3.4) but is a characteristic of displays which can be traced throughout the first century and into the second at villas which were large (Villa dei Papiri), larger (Sperlonga, Punta Epitaffio, Castel Gandolfo) and largest (Hadrian's Villa), including those under various imperial owners. The grouping and pairing of material which is patchily evident at the Villa, and especially round the Scenic Canal is another continuation of display patterns seen in the first century and second AD in small and larger dwellings. The careful placements of statuary relative to long views can again be traced back, but in the Villa the views could be very long indeed.

Prior to Hadrian we know that Polyphemus groups, and Odyssean groups, had repeatedly been placed in watery grottoes. Although the Villa too had its Polyphemus group and its Scylla group (and two Pasquino groups, though there is no evidence at all of where these were set up), I have suggested that these were placed separately, Polyphemus in the Park Grotto, and Scylla in the Scenic Canal. There seems to be an assumption underlying the proposal by Andreae and Salza Prina Ricotti to locate a Polyphemus group somewhere and somehow in the Scenic Triclinium, that its decoration *ought* to follow or imitate in some way the decoration of the grottoes of Sperlonga, Punta Epitaffio and Castel Gandolfo. I do not think the Triclinium is to be understood architecturally as a grotto for the reasons given at 4.1.5, nor was the decoration of grottoes homogenous comparing one with another (say Grotta Azzurra and Sperlonga), or internally (the variety of subject material found at Sperlonga, Punta Epitaffio and Castel Gandolfo). Certainly the Canal did have one sculptural subject in common with Sperlonga and Castel Gandolfo and that is the subject of Scylla attacking Odysseus and his crew. Scylla is set up on a pedestal in the middle of water at all three locations. However Scylla is not apparently a subject exclusive to imperial villas,[100] nor can we establish that it always appears at imperial villas - though one might gain these impressions from some discussions. Unlike Sperlonga and Castel Gandolfo, the Villa Scylla group is out of the 'grotto', in the open air, in the Canal (a setting which is in fact closer to the open sea setting in which the incident took place). The programme of Sperlonga was not repeated exactly, so far as we can tell, at the Villa or anywhere else and the incidents depicted at Sperlonga, with the exception of

---

[100] For example the Oxford group (Waywell 1997 91 n.g), and one from Lanuvium (ibid n.f). The fragments attributed to the Villa Scylla groups by Andreae, if they did not come from the Villa, must have come from other place(s).

the inebriation of Polyphemus, do not actually require or even suggest a grotto or cave-like setting. Their selection for Sperlonga is not directed or suggested by the setting but by some other reasoning or desire not necessarily shared by other villa owners.

It is impossible to dragoon all the sculpture from the Canal under a single iconographic or allegorical heading or force it into a close replication of earlier assemblages. Rather there are, according to the surviving material, a number of themes and of variations on previous themes with some statuary to be read on one level (say iconographic) and some on another (say a reference to the owner's travels, or literary tastes). Earlier assemblages were personal too and the extent to which this is true regardless of date is nicely demonstrated by comparing Cicero, who could not possibly find a home for Bacchantes anywhere on his property,[101] with Hadrian, who apparently could, to judge from the dancer from the Arcaded Triclinium. Thus the sculpture at the Villa associated with water features exemplifies characteristics of Roman display – the repetition of the same subjects but displaying them in different ways, and the use of juxtapositions which we sometimes find surprising, or at least hard to understand, even when the patron is well known.

---

[101] Ad.Fam 1978 No.209.

10. Conclusions

Introduction

The size of the Villa and its chronological homogeneity give a unique opportunity to see water features not vertically as strands of typology (an approach which tends to obscure the continuing selection of older models) - but in a horizontal section illustrating the range of choice available and the kind of selections made. These can then be compared with previous usage, and have been in Chapters 4-9. At various points in the discussion the question of function has been raised – what role or roles did the water feature play? The first part of my conclusions discusses and develops my findings. The second part returns again to the question of context, and the way in which the Villa compares to and sheds light upon the use of water in other dwellings up to the second century AD.

10.1 The roles of decorative water at the Villa

10.1.1 Water both decorative and practical

As explained in the Introduction, I have excluded baths and drains from this study, and as suggested at 3.3 the need for delivery of water to a dwelling was driven first and foremost by practical needs. Beyond that, we might find water being used in a way which was both decorative and practical and we can show that to only a very limited extent in the Villa. There is a possibility that some of the larger pools were used for fish keeping or swimming (5.1.8). The Island Enclosure canal functioned on one level as a moat, as a defence or barrier to access as well as for swimming. The Fountain room below H15 (Cat.1 H16, 6.3.3) may well have served as a point of refreshment for guests arriving at this point in the Villa, maybe to dine at the Water Court, and there may have been similar facilities on the approach to the Central Vestibule (Cat.1 exclusions 18). These features again combine decoration and a more practical use of the water – for drinking, for washing, for swimming, for food supply (or fish as pets). However most of the features I have identified do not appear to have any utilitarian function at all.[1] In this respect the Villa is not surprisingly very different to most

[1] Of course, water may have been drawn off the fountains or pools for local practical use – for cleaning for example.

smaller dwellings where a single water feature might serve a variety of practical water needs and at the same time – with its movement, noise, and any added details - provide a measure of decoration for the area. This is probably true for example of many or most of the decorative water features identified at Ostia especially those of deep walled up basin form.[2]

10.1.2 Areas from which decorative water was excluded

The Villa, although named as a dwelling place[3] and spread over a wide area with much open space in-between (Fig.1), was a place where business was done, and probably a quantity of business proportionate to the emperor's position and responsibilities and therefore more business than would be transacted at other villas. The work would include dealing with the voluminous correspondence of an emperor, meetings with counsellors, receiving guests and supplicants.[4] A significant part of the buildings will have been given over to housing these activities and the personal needs (eating, sleeping, bathing) of the people involved with this business or the general maintenance of the enormous Villa. Some areas are identifiable as providing support facilities of varying standards (the Large Baths less well appointed than the Small, the Service Quarters outside the core buildings sleeping perhaps 700[5] as compared to the Hall of the Cubicles sleeping perhaps 60)[6]. These areas (even as pleasantly decorated as the Hall of the Cubicles)[7] are, so far as we can tell, devoid of decorative water.[8] Humidity was not desirable in other 'working' areas where paper was involved – this would include offices and archives, and libraries for pleasure.[9] Decorative water was far from ubiquitous in the Villa though it was very well distributed over the Villa (Fig.4).[10]

---

[2] Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 have provided much of the base material for a functional or role analysis of the water features of Ostia.
[3] The late fourth century SHA refers to it as both a villa (*Hadr.*26.5) and a palatium (*Zenobia* 30).
[4] See MacDonald and Pinto 1995 17 for a brief overview of the 'work' of an emperor; 183ff for a thoughtful overview of the kind of workers needed at the Villa and 61-62 for the 'office' areas of the Residence.
[5] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 64 (presumably 200 rooms x 3 occupants); Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 84 on the other hand has 125 rooms x 12 occupants = 1500.
[6] 10 rooms x 2 floors x 3 occupants = 60; Salza Prina Ricotti 2001 84 increases to 80.
[7] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 160-162 for a convenient series of photographs of their intricately patterned black and white mosaic floors.
[8] Cat.1 exclusion 4 for the Service Quarters; Cat.1 exclusions 10 and 12 for the Hall of Cubicles area.
[9] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 62 for the only library clearly identifiable at the Villa.
[10] Ehrlich 1989 161-164 asserted that in every complex (or nucleus) where water could have been used decoratively, it was used decoratively. This is a generalisation which rests on a particular count and

Turning to possible reception and meeting[11] areas, the evidence is less clear-cut but it is clear that water, if present, was not central or dominating. There is no water at the Apsidal Hall,[12] or the Ceremonial Precinct.[13] The evidence for water in the area of the Central Vestibule is uncertain.[14] Then there are covered areas whose function is unclear and ambiguous (to us at least). Some of these have a conspicuous association with water (for example the Arcaded Triclinium fountain suite main room, the north and south halls of the Stadium Garden, as discussed in Chapter 7). Some do not - the main rooms of Fountain Courts East and West (Fig.22) have a view out onto comparatively low-key water features, and no water inside. The presence or absence of water in these areas and especially inside the rooms may be in part an indicator of formality, or lack of it. If we take the usual identification of the Domus Flavia as the public part of Domitian's palace, none of the large rooms there, except the Triclinium, have water inside though they each have a view of water outside.

For meeting and reception areas, in Hadrian's position, the ability to select from a range of different locations one appropriate to the occasion and company (larger, smaller, a sealed room for privacy, an open one for less private matters, one on the perimeter of the Villa for visitors who were not to be admitted to the core, and so on) was important. For Vitruvius,[15] it is implicit I think that great men need a variety of different rooms in which to discharge their social obligation, meetings, and judicial functions, and that rooms were not limited to one function. This 'otiose' choice of location is visible in lesser dwellings than the emperor's.[16] The presence or absence of a water feature will have figured somehow in the selection process, and I am suggesting, as indicated, that water is probably associated with less formal settings because of its own association with leisure as further discussed below. Again, the situation is very different in small dwellings. If we look for example at the large block fountain from the Casa di Diana at Ostia, which probably dates to a little after

---

division of complexes, and an inaccurate identification of decorative water features (for example see Cat.1 exclusions 5, 7, 10 and 19) and the true picture is more complex.

[11] The *SHA* specifically mentions a building named 'Prytaneum' (council hall) among the Villa's structures though we do not know which building, if any in truth, was given this description.

[12] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 66 compares this structure, correctly I think, to an auditorium or (civic) council building.

[13] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 78ff.

[14] Cat.1 exclusions 18.

[15] 6.5.1-2.

[16] Wallace-Hadrill 1994 52ff, 58 for 'grading' the degree of intimacy in which amici were received.

Hadrian,[17] the excavators quite rightly point out that it was orientated to provide a view from the triclinium. However it was very large, located in the only part of the house open to the sky, and in the centre of the house. In effect it would have been hard to get away from the sight or sound of it and the water feature was unavoidably involved in many of the house activities apart from dining. At the most basic level the courtyard was the only source of good natural light for any activity which required it, and the courtyard had to be navigated to get from one end or side of the house to another. The luxury of having multiple choices of completely distinct environments, which might vary in their use of water as well as other aspects, was not available outside the largest villas.

10.1.3 Water and dining

Water and dining has already entered into the discussion of grottoes, fountain rooms and fountain walls in Chapter 4 and of the large complex features in Chapter 7 and here I look in more detail at some aspects of dining at the Villa which are connected with the water features.

The dining obligations of the emperor were more extensive than those of other people and there are literary references to large formal banquets involving members of the Senate and important people and even the entertainment of the whole population.[18] We do not know how often these large events took place, and so far as we can tell, all the references are to events in Rome. If Domitian wanted to entertain large numbers of people (not perhaps the 1000 tables exaggerated by Statius but nonetheless a large enough number so there was no question of the host truly mixing with his guests) he put them in a big lofty room (Fig.132 13) where everyone could see him albeit distantly. He decorated it in grand style[19] and provided water works (Fig.132 12 and 14, Fig.131).

We should not necessarily assume that Hadrian would want or need to undertake the full range of dining obligations from the Villa and especially not those for large groups, in fact I think the opposite is true. Although we have seen that business was

---

[17] Marinucci 2001.
[18] Tamm 1963 189ff.
[19] Statius *Silvae* 4.2.

transacted at the Villa, country dwellings were still recognised, to some extent, as places of retreat. Pliny visiting Trajan at Civitavecchia (to work) expected 'also to see his lighter moods, in the sort of country environment where these qualities are easily revealed.'[20] There is no reason to think that Hadrian would have wished to regularly invite hundreds of people to travel out from Rome to dine with him, giving rise to all kinds of overnight travel and accommodation issues.[21] Purpose built and/or longstanding arrangements were already available to him in the capital, from whence people could return to their own beds.

The only buildings which clearly suggest that the entertainment of large numbers of people was envisaged at the Villa are the theatres.[22] The North theatre (Fig.1 2) was on the perimeter of the Villa and had a large portico attached which could have served for banqueting guests there, if dining was also offered. Little is known about the South Theatre, again very much on the periphery of the Villa (Fig.1 48). The resident population of the Villa was such that the prime purpose of these buildings could have been to entertain them.[23] In discussing the large complex features at the Villa I have raised doubts about their practical suitability (with the possible exception of the Scenic Triclinium and Canal) for entertaining very large numbers of guests at the Villa, even if Hadrian wanted to.[24]

Perhaps the model we should have in mind when thinking of Hadrian's usual dining habits at the Villa should not be that of Domitian on the Palatine but that of Trajan in his villa at Civitavecchia as described by Pliny. After the day's work was done Pliny enjoyed the company of the emperor, recitations, pleasant conversation and the 'charm and informality of our social life'.[25] All this is consistent with small informal groups, not large formal banquets. The Villa structures too suggest the regular entertainment of relatively small numbers (40 or 50 or far fewer) in truly luxurious style. The largest and most complex water features appear to have been designed so that their best dining

---

[20] *Ep.*5.31.2
[21] With dinner beginning mid afternoon and potentially lasting 'well into the night' (Dunbabin 1996 66).
[22] See Cat.1 exclusion 16 for the 'arena' which, if it was an arena, can only have held a few hundred and was outside the Villa perimeter. See Cat.2 exclusion 4 for the unproven plan for a stadium at the Villa.
[23] Salza Prina Ricotti 1996 138 offers estimates of capacity (but note that her estimate for the 'arena' at least is certainly much too high, see Cat.1 exclusions 16).
[24] Arcaded Triclinium 7.2.1; Stadium Garden 7.3.3; Water Court 7.4.1; Scenic Triclinium and Canal 7.5.2.
[25] *Ep.*5.31.13-14

positions[26] could be enjoyed by a relatively small number of people – designed with the few, not the many, uppermost in mind. The extravagant provision for the few is in keeping with Roman habits for the previous 200 years. Moreover, if we look at the villa dining areas of Hadrian's predecessors, the little we know about them suggests that they too catered for relatively small numbers of people – the dining island at Sperlonga, the couches at Punta Epitaffio, maybe the dining arrangements looking into the Ninfeo Bergantino at Castel Gandolfo (though these have disappeared on the ground).

Leaving aside the question of numbers, it is evident that the connection between water and dining shown in the first century is maintained at the Villa albeit in somewhat different forms. As already discussed in Chapters 4-7, the Scenic Triclinium (Cat.1 H17) and the Fountain stibadium (Cat.1 H8) were undoubtedly dining areas. The Island Enclosure (Cat.1 H6) must have included dining in its 'miniature villa' functions. I believe the Fountain room on the north side of the Residence was probably part of a dining suite (Cat.1 H9) and the Arcaded Triclinium fountain suite main room could have been used for dining (Cat.1 H10). The Stadium Garden had dining suites looking onto it (Cat.1 H12). The Water Court (Cat.1 H14) and the Water feature adjoining the Water Court (Cat.1 H15) could both accommodate diners. The Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium very likely served as a dining room (Cat.1 H18), and the Park Grotto (Cat.1 H20) had outside dining potential. It could have served as a less formal summer dining area, perhaps with some temporary or fragile shading structure, facing into the grotto display. The underground road with an exit nearby (shown at Fig.94.1) could conveniently bring people and indeed food and drink. In total then half the Hadrianic water features have clear dining potential, in differing orders of magnitude, and with differing styles and especially outlooks.

The Scenic Triclinium and Fountain stibadium preserve unequivocal evidence of stibadium dining arrangements, both containing curved canals which in some ways replace the internal and external pools and canals sometimes found in earlier rectangular water dining arrangements, as discussed at 4.2.2. Three more buildings contain spaces absolutely suited to stibadia (rather than rectangular couch arrangements) - the Water Court, the Water feature adjoining the Water Court and the

---

[26] Those occupying the central room of the Water Court, the stibadium at the Scenic Triclinium and so on.

Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium and I have discussed the vestibule facing the Cavea fountain Cat.1 R6 as a potential dining area (see 7.5.3 generally). This frequency suggests that the stibadium, and in this case the covered stibadium with a watery view or setting, was far more popular by the early part of the 2nd century AD – at least with Hadrian – than is sometimes credited. Dunbabin accepts that the outdoor stibadium existed in the 1st century AD (one example from Pompeii, Pliny's description of his Tuscan hippodromus, two references by Martial).[27] She finds no clear archaeological evidence for the existence of 'rooms' designed for the stibadium before the late 2nd century.[28]

Dunbabin may well be correct in thinking that the stibadium originated in an arrangement of cushions picnic style on the ground, and thus appeared first outside, but it seems to me that the Scenic Triclinium (which she classes as an outdoor stibadium) and the Fountain stibadium (which she does not mention) are neither outdoor nor in any sense casual in the way that a simple pergola arrangement over a couch might be. It is a little like saying that dining rooms such as the north dining room at the Stadium Garden[29] are 'outside' because they are open at the front. These stibadia are set in buildings, as large and solidly constructed as any dining hall, and (certainly in the case of the Scenic Triclinium) as lavishly decorated. I would agree that they are open at the front (and in the case of the Scenic Triclinium, somewhat open at the rear), and thus they are airy buildings, best suited to warm weather dining (and both oriented north). It may be that they represent a transitional stage during which the stibadium was moving fully 'indoors'. However it seems that there was already one structure at the Villa where the stibadium was fully indoors, much earlier than the end of the 2nd century, and that was the Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium.

---

[27] Pompeii and Pliny's stibadium are outdoors; Dunbabin agrees Martial's references are neutral as to context except that a couch inlaid with tortoiseshell is perhaps less likely to have been used outdoors (14.87 also 10.48).
[28] Her views and the 1st century evidence are summarised at Dunbabin 1991 131ff and Dunbabin 1996 74-76. She also notes (1996 n.40) the structure on the Fountain Court Terrace (Fig.22 pre Hadrianic structure) as a possible 'transitional' model. As explained in the catalogue entry, this structure is hard to pin down and date. Rakob 1973 n.28 seems to describe it as a Flavian triconch (which would strongly suggest dining, if true) – but I cannot detect this shape on the published plan and no reason is given for the dating. Rakob 1987 (later) does not repeat these suggestions.
[29] Fig.55 No.2.

10.1.4 Water, dining, and entertainment

The increasing popularity of stibadium dining has been linked with entertainment becoming more important as an aspect of dining - the stibadium arrangement offering better space for entertainers to perform, with good visibility for all guests.[30] This may be true in general, or later.

At the Villa, the Fountain room on the north side of the Residence, the Arcaded Triclinium fountain suite main room and the Stadium Garden dining suites were rectangular rooms where the space available for entertainment very much depended on the number and arrangement of the couches. The views, especially the axial views across the Stadium Garden, and those surrounding the Arcaded Triclinium main room, and the provision of moving water features in line of vision, nonetheless made the setting dramatic and perhaps entertainment in itself. The difficulties of providing entertainment visible to all potential diners at the Water Court main building have already been discussed (7.4.1), so again here the stunning watery setting may have been the intended focus of interest. The only real space available in front of the Fountain stibadium was open air (but it was a summer dining room, probably). Dining, and entertainment, in the more restricted area of the Island Enclosure, can only have been small scale. The only space for entertainment at the Water feature adjoining the Water Court would be within the area of the stibadium or on the uncovered walkway outside. There was a small space in front of the stibadium area of the Fountain room south east of the Scenic Triclinium (Fig.91.1) which would permit servants to manoeuvre and small-scale entertainment. The Scenic Triclinium did offer very specific possibilities for large-scale entertainment on the water, with good visibility for many diners, as well as views incorporating not just the water but dramatic and carefully programmed art works. Of course wholly outdoor dining, which I have hypothesised at the Park Grotto, and for which there was great potential at the Villa, but which has left no trace in the archaeological record, offered much more space and scope.[31]

---

[30] Dunbabin 1996 78 and Dunbabin 1991 135. Jones C P 1991deals with the types of entertainment which might be associated with private dinners and public feasting but not with the facilities which might be needed for different sorts of performance.
[31] Dunbabin 1996 70.

In fact at the Villa then, the dining arrangements and especially those associated with the water features do not suggest a preoccupation with entertainment. In most places the space available actually in the dining area was limited, or not under cover, and not so different from arrangements found in much humbler water dining areas 100 years earlier in Pompeii. On the other hand, if many of these Villa locations in fact catered for relatively small numbers of diners as suggested above then, small scale entertainment (readings, recitations, music) may have been thought appropriate, with the setting itself (and food) remaining the key part of the dining experience.

10.1.5 Backdrops and vistas

I identified in the review of previous research at 3.3 the use of water in the creation of impressive views and this is strongly visible at the Villa especially within the large complex features.

In a few locations, the water architecture also provided a dramatic backdrop to dining positions. Most obviously, at the Scenic Triclinium, the fountain wall and rear extension framed and highlighted whoever was reclining on the stibadium or the dining platform (Fig.85.1), but the same was true of the fountain wall in the Water Court, if, as seems very probable, the main stibadium was set up in front of it, and the Fountain stibadium. This leads us into the final part of the discussion on the roles of water features where I am going to look particularly at the idea of conspicuous consumption.

10.1.6 Other roles

The number of water features at the Villa, the variety among them and within them, all suggest the conclusion that the designer was someone who shared Pliny's pleasure in the sight and sound of water in different forms – laid out in large calm pools, trickling down multiple steps, casting sparkling reflections onto roofs. Suetonius says that Augustus slept in the summer in a courtyard by a fountain; Pliny has several bedrooms from which he can hear the noise of water.[32] We also find fountains specifically

---

[32] *Aug.*82; *Ep.*5.6.22-23, another at 23-24, and at 39-40. The sea could be heard at his Laurentine villa (otherwise short of water) – by inference from most of the bedrooms too, since one is specifically noted as a location where it is not possible to hear it (2.17.22).

designed to be seen through windows[33] and sleeping within earshot of water would also be possible at the Villa – perhaps from the room adjoining Fountain Court feature 2, or from the rooms adjoining the Fountain room on the North side of the Residence Block (Cat.1 H9), and on the Island Enclosure. There are places too in which the designer appears to be playing with the possibilities of water – making an island, recalling but not replicating a stadium or theatre cavea. The extent to which religious feeling attached to decorative water is also discussed at 3.3 - the evidence for religious buildings at the Villa is limited and again there is no clear link with decorative water.[34]

The water features of the Villa were undoubtedly also constructed, as we can most clearly see at the Scenic Canal, as educated landscapes with sculptural collections through which the owner could convey messages about himself and his interests, but the most striking aspect of the water features at the Villa is their extravagance. This is not just a question of the number of features, the number of large complex features, or the number of features within the large complex features. It shows in other ways – the massive raised tank of the Peristyle Pool Building, not repeated anywhere else that we can see; the multiplied displays of steps so the onlooker was enveloped by water; the Water Court where different devices were deployed all around the main room. The similar extravagance of the sculptural material can also perhaps be dimly glimpsed through the use of tripod fountains. It is hard to escape the conclusion that this is conspicuous consumption of water on a prodigious scale.

Finally, the Villa structures strongly suggest that the designer of the water features, whether this was Hadrian himself or his architect - although drawing on a very wide range of motifs, inventing new ones, and combining them in many novel ways - had a preference for simple lines and curves. Mixtilinear sides to large and small pools are absent, as are block fountains with complex structures. Since all these characteristics appear before Hadrian and occur after, this seems to be a clear example of the expression of personal taste in design at the Villa.

---

[33] Most of the block fountains (5.2).

[34] MacDonald and Pinto 1995 133-134 generally. See Cat.1 exclusions 18 for recent excavations of a possible religious structure on the approach to Central Vestibule. Cat.1 H3 may have a link with Hercules (4.2.4).

10.2 The water features of the Villa in the context of other dwellings

10.2.1 Typology of villas

Romizzi 2001 is the latest[35] thorough attempt to analyse Roman villas typologically. Since it terminates at the end of the first century AD, it does not include Hadrian's Villa – but if it did, the Villa would be Type 5 'A padiglioni', a type which she says flourished under Hadrian, though there are examples dating back to the end of the second century BC.[36] Her list includes many imperial villas. Type 5 villas consist of a number of architecturally distinct nuclei which are strung out and loosely connected, maybe over different levels. Consequently each Type 5 villa is unique and each nucleus within it could have a different function, or style, or orientation/view, could be more (or less) self sufficient, be more or less suited to different times of the year – in short provide many opportunities for the exercise of choice which was important for enjoyment and relaxation. I think it is clear that Type 5 is a distinguishable class and one which is particularly well suited to the pleasures of otium and also to the variable display of water, given a good supply. The separation of the nuclei gave the opportunity for a very wide range of types of water display.

Patently Hadrian's Villa was built as a collection of nuclei, in places tightly packed and in places loosely strung out, and which might take different orientations (Fig.1). In Chapter 7, I observed that the large complex water features were all enclosed and inward looking and this is a consequence of their conception as stand alone nuclei.

10.2.2 The Villa and other large dwellings

Type 5 villas are, because of their strung out nature, particularly at risk of partial destruction and hard to identify, and it has been very difficult to find comparison for the Villa among them.[37] There is simply nothing else in this class which is as well known or preserves anything like the same quantity of water features. Having said

---

[35] She discusses previous classifications at 50ff.
[36] 215ff; list 102-103.
[37] For example, a Type 5 villa may include, as one of its nuclei, an atrium complex or a peristyle complex. If that is the only part that survives, and it is big enough for habitation, the villa will look like Romizzi 2001 Type 1 or Type 3.

that, in the main body of the thesis it has been possible to see from the Villa material and from the evidence of other large villas that for example the fountain room had declined in popularity as a new building choice, and that pools – and often very large ones - were much more important in villa water feature design than the previous emphasis on elevated water features (the so called nymphaea and ninfei) has given credit for. There is a collection of Republican water features identifiable at the Villa site (six, not necessarily from the same villa, Fig.3) to compare with the Hadrianic features identifiable at the site (twenty one, Fig.4). Half the Republican features are fountain rooms (Cat.1 R1, 3 and 6); there is one wall fountain fronting a cistern (R2), one rocky niche (R4), and one cavea fountain (R5). In the Hadrianic water feature collection new fountain rooms are barely found at all (4.2); fountain walls are bigger and maybe curved (4.4) and the cavea shape has been incorporated in a complex design (4.3 and 7.3). There is a full size artificial grotto (Cat.1 H20) rather than a rocky niche and a whole range of features and complexes with multiple water features which find no earlier parallels on the site. This comparison, on the same site, nicely exemplifies the increasingly sophisticated design of water features developing over the intervening 150 or so years and the increased range of choice available to those with the money to spend.

The contrasts between the Villa and Domitian's constructions on the Palatine – one of the better preserved dwellings and with a large number of water features - have surfaced at several points. It is not always clear whether these are being driven by differences in the space available, perceived differences between town and country architecture, forty years time difference, or personal taste/fashion. Hadrian must have been very much aware of the architecture of the Palatine and the changes made there by him indicate it was actively used. It is clear that whatever bad associations might have resulted from Domitian's reign had been obliterated by subsequent events.[38] As discussed at 10.1.2 the Palatine and the Villa were both used as seat of government and as dwelling (in effect as a palace), but the differences between their water architecture, which have been touched on in earlier Chapters, are considerable.

[38] Darwall Smith 1996 203-7 and 214-5 assesses the differing impact of the building as portrayed by Statius and Pliny in relation to Domitian and the atmosphere of the same building under Trajan.

It may be useful to summarise here the known water features from the Domitianic Palatine for comparison with the list at the Villa.[39] There were 3 large peristyle pools (Fig.132 10, 19 and Fig.133 7), and another in the Vigna Barberini area.[40] There were 2 built fountains in pools (Fig.132 12 and 14) and a pair of fountain rooms (Fig.132 rooms either side of 20), plus one other fountain room about which very little indeed is known.[41] At the lower level there were a pair of pools surrounded by architecture (Fig.133 11 and 13) and a third (Fig.133 2) perhaps a swimming pool and perhaps adjoined by a fountain wall.[42] At the same level there were 8 small floor basins (Fig.135.2). There may have been pair of octagonal water rooms, and some water adjoining another octagonal room on the upper levels.[43] In the Hippodrome Garden there was water (at least) in semicircular pools.

The difference between the general plan of Hadrian's Villa (a padiglioni) and the symmetry and regularity on the Palatine is immediately visible from a comparison of Fig.1 and Figs.132 and 133. The symmetrical and repetitive design of the overall Domus Flavia and Augustana plans extends to the water features. Many of the water features are arranged in pairs. There are no less than three peristyle gardens with water (all visible on Fig.132), all almost exactly the same size and proportions, all containing a basin of almost exactly the same size, though differing in contents. Neither the Villa's water features nor its general planning show these characteristics to such an extent. The designer of Fountain Courts East and West did not make the two towers the same, nor even preserve symmetry in the rooms flanking the main rooms (Fig.22). The space around the east side of the Scenic Triclinium was divided into rooms (Fig.81 12-17), whereas exactly the same space on the west side was not divided (Fig.81 11). Pairings and repetitions in water features occur only in minor features such as the pools either side of the main room of the Water Court, and in the Water Court vestibule. The Arcaded Triclinium main suite is a riot of asymmetry - three of the spaces adjoining the main room are semicircular and the fourth rectangular. The detailed design of the three semicircular spaces is different in each case (Fig.46). No

---

[39] With the proviso that large parts of the Palatine – the Vigna Barberini area, the area of the Farnese Gardens, are only just beginning to be studied – and our picture of the extent and history of the structures is far from complete.
[40] Vigna Barberini 2001 65.
[41] Neuerburg 1965 Cat.180 (the relationship between this area of the Palatine and the rest of the palace is not clear).
[42] 4.4.4 and 5.1.5.
[43] See 7.4.2.

two gardens at the Villa are the same size and shape.[44] Although planning at the Villa was much less regular and symmetrical, there was no creation of water features of a natural appearance - no irregular pools,[45] winding streams (apart from the modest streams of the adjoining east and west valleys), no cascades.[46] The Villa did not attempt to create the context of the maritime or lakeside villas or indeed other Tivoli villas with their Anio views. The Park Grotto, with its straight approach valley and regularised cavity (Fig.95) has not actually been made to look natural at all.

Another point of difference with the Palatine is that the large complex Villa water features used water in multiple combinations so that it was visible and audible and coming not just from one angle but several. The prime positions in the Scenic Triclinium and Water Court main room had water above and below them, at their backs and in front of them. The Stadium Garden north hall had water within and also visible in different forms through its doors and windows. Water trickled along the full width of fountain walls from several niches or along full width steps. The only clear example on the Palatine of a room which viewed or heard water from more than one direction is the Triclinium on the upper level (Fig.132 13) which had the oval block fountains either side and the labyrinth pool visible through the third side.[47] This design is to some extent repeated (as discussed in 7.2.1), at the Arcaded Triclinium main suite, and Domitian too had earlier had his Hippodrome or Stadium Garden, but there is nothing comparable to the complex water designs of the Scenic Triclinium or Water Court main room at the Palatine or the multiple use of water features in the construction of long views.

Other features of Domitianic design on the Palatine are not repeated at the Villa as we have seen at various points in the thesis. The Domitianic mixtilinear pools on the Palatine were maintained under Hadrian – with the exception of the pool in the Vigna

---

[44] There is some similarity in the canals and planting beds of the Water Court peristyle and the north part of the Stadium Garden but the proportions and setting are quite different. The two cavea fountains have the same basic shape but different settings, basins, and probably step features, although Cat.1 R5 is really too decayed to be sure.

[45] Unless, possibly, MacDonald and Pinto 1995's conjecture about the Bog is correct (Cat.1 exclusions 1).

[46] I have explained at Cat.1 H17 and 20 why I do not think cascades at the Scenic Triclinium or Park Grotto were likely.

[47] I have also indicated at 4.4.4 that the in the area of Fig.133 2 there may be an early covered curved fountain wall adjoining a long pool.

Barberini area, which was 'replaced' by two fountains in basins[48] - but Hadrian did not construct anything like them at the Villa, nor did he build pools with complex internal built features like those of the pelta and labyrinth pools on the Palatine. His monumental block fountain is simpler in design and conception than the Domus Flavia oval islands (compare Figs.48.1 and 131.1).

These marked contrasts between the collection of features on the Palatine and the collection at the Villa suggests that the designer of the Villa water features not only had a preference for simpler shapes but chose to use water even more extensively and in a greater range of ways, not repeating designs, and inventing new combinations and variations in a flexible and imaginative way – like for example the octagonal fountain room of the Water Court or the pool designed for the irregular space of the Fountain Court terrace. As work continues at the sites of the larger dwellings contemporaneous to or earlier than Hadrian's Villa – on the Palatine and at places like for example the Villa dei Quintili – other collections of water features will hopefully come to light which will shed more light on the choices being made in the larger dwellings.

10.2.3 The Villa and the smaller dwellings

The evidence of the smaller dwellings which has been used as a point of comparison for the Villa has highlighted some of the characteristics of the smaller dwellings and suggested areas which would merit further research elsewhere. It has highlighted not surprisingly the fact that the larger built features occur much less frequently in the smaller dwellings – they were expensive, served no practical purpose and took up space. Where we can get at least a fragmentary picture of the occurrence of water features in towns outside Rome fountain rooms and walls occur rarely and some of the largest features (caves fountains, grottoes, covered curved fountain walls) are not attempted at all, so far as we can tell. Small pools in courtyards or gardens, small raised tanks, single niche fountains appear much more regularly and this is true not just for Pompeii and Ostia but across the broader canvas of north Italy.[49] Dwellings with more than one significant water feature are unusual though they are occasionally identifiable – as for example in the House of Loreius Tiburtinus at Pompeii with its

---

[48] The excavators suggest the replacement may have been prompted by settlement underneath the old pool (Vigna Barberini 2001 69f).
[49] As outlined by George 1997 8-11.

elaborate planted basin in the atrium, and two canals, one incorporating a biclinium and one a number of different elements including a built stepped fountain. The sculptural decoration of a water feature was easier to replicate in these environments though, simply by miniaturising it.

In the smaller dwellings decorative water was much more likely to intrude into areas from which it was excluded at the Villa. Watery spaces had more than one role – the one colonnaded garden or courtyard might (have to) serve as a place of work – for food preparation, making repairs, sewing and so on – as well as giving a pleasant dining view. In larger dwellings and above all at the Villa places could be created solely or mainly for one form of activity, or several different places could be made for essentially the same form of activity. Conspicuous consumption was still evidently a driver but the water feature in a small dwelling was likely to play a much more complex role in the daily life of the inhabitants and one which has been little investigated.

11. Summary

In this final section of the thesis I have summarised my main findings indicating where and how they appear to me to have advanced the study of the subject and noting areas where further study would apparently be fruitful. In general the research could be extended both chronologically, outside Italy, and to buildings other than dwellings with water features.

The critical assessment of the literature, structures, and objects associated with the Villa which has produced Catalogues 1 and 2 in the Appendix, enabled me to proceed to evaluate the broader significance of the water features in the main body of the thesis. The Catalogues will also serve as a research resource for future studies in related areas.

Clearly with large parts of the Villa still unexcavated there are potentially many more locations still to be found. Full publication of recent work in the approach area to the Central Vestibule may well produce new water features. A better understanding of the water distribution network to and within the Villa based on an inch by inch examination of the site would maybe indicate other areas where water was used decoratively or clarify outstanding points of detail.

The analysis in Chapter 2 led to the conclusion that there were the remains of more than one villa on the site when Hadrian began work and that at least two of the existing water features were retained within the vastly extended new Villa. The complex reasons why this might have happened were explored at 2.5. The whole question of how and why the Romans retained and reused earlier constructions is one which could be explored further looking at the many villas and other buildings where there are distinct building phases.

The existing architectural typologies for fountain structures were not found to be applicable to the many structures at the Villa which combine more than one type of feature, or the pools which do not meet the definition of 'ninfei'. Since they tended to separate the water feature from its broader physical context they did not, as they stood, facilitate the answering of questions about why particular designs were used where and

what role the feature played in the lives of the inhabitants of the Villa. I also found that some smaller design characteristics – water steps and small, deep, walled up basins had not perhaps been identified as clearly as they could have been – and that block fountains, freestanding solid structures, had not been identified as a clear type at all. This led me to devise (Chapter 3) and apply (Chapters 4-7) my own way of classifying the structures at the Villa. I used but reappraised some broad previously suggested types (grottoes, fountain rooms, cavea shapes and fountain walls), added pools, and block fountains and addressed the use of water steps and deep walled up basins. Each large complex feature was also approached as a separate ensemble.

I found that creating grottoes was only one small element of the overall water design of the Villa and that the idea that there was a homogeneous functional class of grotto triclinia did not stand up to close inspection at the Villa or elsewhere (4.1). I found that fountain rooms of simple form were not prominent at the Villa and that cavea fountains were utilised as part of much larger designs (4.2 and 4.3). I found that the flat fountain walls of the Villa were by and large selective elaborations of structures which would be there anyway (4.4) and I began to make a connection between curved covered fountain walls, and curved covered walls generally, and stibadium dining (4.4). This was to be reinforced by consideration of the large complex features and shed new light on the occurrence of stibadium dining. Finally, I found that monumental façade fountains were developed to fulfil a particular display role which was absent from villas.

My consideration of the large outdoor pools led me to conclude that at the Villa there was both a clear-cut distinction between deep pools and shallow pools, and an avoidance here of the pools with complex internally niched sides which occurred in first century structures, and in later structures (5.1). The size and frequent occurrence of large pools, not just at the Villa but in many other large dwellings indicates what an important part of large-scale water Roman design they were but they have previously been neglected and excluded from water feature catalogues.

The smaller indoor pools have also perhaps not previously received the attention they deserve and 5.2 found that, taking their inspiration originally from the impluvium, from the first century AD onwards they had found places in other indoor locations. On the other hand, I found that the arrangement of dining couches around a rectangular

pool was not clearly attested at the Villa and that in effect it was replaced by stibadium dining close to water, which is attested at the Villa. Again, the use of smaller pools in all kinds of dwellings, indoor and outdoor, is an area which would reward more extensive study.

Although block fountains have long been recognised separately at the Villa, they have not previously been grouped together by researchers as a class, and I found that the smaller examples at the Villa were usually used to elevate a spout to window level (6.1). Whether the large block fountain in the Arcaded Triclinium has a design relationship with other large built fountains in locations other than dwellings (for example the Meta Sudans in Rome) is an area for further research which is outside the scope of this study.

6.2 contains new detailed analysis of the occurrence of water steps as decoration prior to Hadrian and found that usage at the Villa was characterised by multiple sets and by very wide runs of steps, usage which had developed from the first century use of predominantly narrower single runs. 6.3 identified small deep walled up basins which were used occasionally as part of the Villa repertoire as a sophisticated rendition of the kind of basins which occurred in dwellings large and small, very often simply as a convenient way of storing a larger quantity of water ready to hand.

Turning to the large complex features, in discussion about the Island Enclosure at 7.1, I found that there were previously unidentified resemblances to decorative pools with island like structures at their centres, though this was only one influence on the design. My analysis of the design of the Arcaded Triclinium (7.2) supported existing suggestions that it potentially filled more roles than that of triclinium and did not support suggestions that the existence of a pavonazzetto slab in the middle indicated a particular mode of triclinium use. I found the Stadium Garden (7.3) to be a version of a recognisable Roman type whose design could and did vary greatly, and that dining was one of its uses. In the Water Court (7.4), I concluded that there was an exceptionally extensive use of water compared to other identifiable octagonal fountain rooms. This is an area where comparison with baths might have been revealing, had the scope of the thesis been able to extend that far. For the Scenic Triclinium and Canal (7.5) I have interpreted the evidence as suggesting a more limited ideal dining capacity than recently proposed, and by comparing it with other similar structures at

the Villa, reinforced developing findings about stibadium dining at the Villa and elsewhere.

I found that the large complex features all involved the creation of long axial views interspersed with water and most were closed complexes, offering no views of a wider or natural landscape, that even where they could be shown to draw on recognisable preceding designs they were not close replicas of any identifiable models, and that they provided a wide range of dining locations differing in setting and capacity.

The critical assessment of existing research on decoration at Chapter 3 established that although there was extensive literature relating to Roman figure sculpture from villas and other dwellings, analysis of water containers (basins, craters and so on) generally has been limited. It may be that when more work has been done on this, beyond what I have been able to do here, more can be deduced about their likely use at the Villa, since the direct surviving evidence from the Villa, though of great interest, is limited in quantity.

8.1 looked at the surface decoration of the Villa water features and found that there is greater continuing use of pumice here and elsewhere than the existing literature might lead one to expect but that the use of marble facings and mosaic is consistent with the general picture of their decorative use at the end of the first century AD. My examination of precedents for point of exit decoration (8.2) showed that assumptions that theatrical masks acted as fountain spouts needed to be treated cautiously while evidence for point of exit decoration from the Villa is sparse and difficult to interpret. In the absence of existing literature on water containers, 8.3 began with an inevitably brief review of the precedents, as they appeared to me, which might usefully be expanded considerably in another place. The main finding of the analysis of this subset of the Villa sculpture was that the tripod fountains represented there occurred rarely elsewhere and this – and their very occurrence at the Villa - suggested that their more complex design put them among the most costly and uncommon types of water container.

Because of the quantity of sculpture missing from the Villa and the difficulty of precisely locating sculpture from other locations with water features, the conclusions which could be drawn about the choice of statuary placed with pools, in niches and

other fountain structures at the Villa or any other large dwelling are limited (9.1-2). However I did conclude that the Villa Niobid group was unlikely to have been placed directly in or around a water feature.. The evidence for statuary from grottoes is better and I made a new proposal on this basis for the location of the Polyphemus group from the Villa (9.3). In 9.4 I concluded that the Villa sculpture uses pairings as previous displays did. The rest of 9.4 dealt extensively with sculpture from the Scenic Triclinium and Canal, finding that, despite a variety of suggestions, no clear conclusions can be drawn about the sculpture chosen for the Scenic Triclinium. I also concluded that there was one Scylla group in the Canal, and that the case for two has not been proved. 9.5 found that the Villa statuary associated with water features, like statuary from other locations, was set up with particular views in mind, not just direct views of say a fountain wall, but also longer perspectives through various intersecting planes. Finally I found that sculpture finds from the Villa water features and from other locations demonstrate that though there might be numerically popular themes and subjects, groupings were not repeated slavishly but varied and very often there was great breadth of subject matter in a full water feature programme making different references and allusions. This, rather than homogeneity, was a characteristic of Roman decorative water display programmes.

Chapter 10, the thesis Conclusions, discussed and developed the findings emerging in Chapters 4-9, looking first at the role of decorative water at the Villa (10.1). Although occasionally water was found in a context where it was both useful and decorative, it was not ubiquitous at the Villa and there were areas where it had no role to play. It did play a prominent part in many dining areas and I found that contrary to some recent suggestions a critical examination of the physical and source evidence suggested that dining environments at the Villa were not principally devised with very large numbers of people in mind. I also suggested that covered stibadium dining was well established at the Villa in advance of the late second century date elsewhere suggested. I found that the water in the dining areas actually tended to inhibit the possibility of offering entertainment so in these cases at least the choice of stibadium arrangements was not driven by greater suitability for entertainment, as has also been suggested. I drew together findings about the use of water generally in creating backdrops and vistas and concluded that at the Villa the spectacular displays of water in many locations were not just about providing pleasant ambience and sensory pleasure but also presented a deliberately impressive display of conspicuous consumption.

In the second part of the thesis Conclusions (10.2) I returned to the question of the relationship between the Villa and its architectural context, looking at the whole collection of water features at the Villa. A comparison with the numerous water features on the Palatine highlighted in particular the lack of repetitiveness at the Villa, the use of water to surround the occupant of a room, and very marked preferences in pool design. I looked more broadly at the differences and similarities between the smaller dwellings and the Villa, and found that the range of water features attempted in the smaller dwellings was limited. Water features occurred regularly but were more likely to serve dual practical and decorative purposes, and to be places where many types of activity were carried out. The use of water within smaller dwellings is another area where much more detailed analysis could usefully be undertaken.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Abbreviations follow *American Journal of Archaeology* 104 (2000) 10-24 and in addition:

Ad Fam. 1978 — *Cicero's letters to his friends.* Shackleton Bailey D R (trans.). Harmondsworth, 1978.

Adriano 2000 — *Adriano: architettura e progetto.* (Exhibition catalogue). Milan, 2000.

Aicher 1993 — Aicher P J. 'Terminal display fountains and the aqueducts of ancient Rome.' *Phoenix* 47 (1993) 339-352.

Ambrogi 1995 — Ambrogi A. *Vasche di età romana in marmi bianchi e colorati.* Rome, 1995.

Ambrogi 1998 — Ambrogi A. 'Labrum porfiretico rinvenuto nel Templum Pacis. Note preliminari.' *BullCom* 99 (1998) 257-272.

Amelung 1897 — Amelung W. 'Dell'arte Alessandrina a proposito di due teste rinvenuti in Roma'. *BullCom* 25 (1897) 129-134.

Amelung and Lippold — Amelung W and Lippold G. *Die Sculpturen des Vaticanischen Museums.* Berlin, 1903-56 (4 vols.).

Andersson 1990 — Andersson E B. 'Fountains and the Roman dwelling: Casa del Torello in Pompeii.' *JdI* 105 (1990) 207-236.

Andersson 1991 — Andersson E B. 'Metamorphoses in water'. *Latomus* 50 (1991) 544-562.

Andreae 1976 — Andreae B. 'Schmuck eines Wasserbecken in Sperlonga. Zum Typus der sitzenden Knäblein aus dem Schiffsfund von Mahdia.' *RM* 83 (1976) 287-309.

Andreae 1982 — Andreae B. *Odysseus: Archäologie des europaischen Menschenbildes.* Frankfurt, 1982.

Andreae 1983 — Andreae B. *L'immagine di Ulisse: mito e archeologia.* Turin, 1983.

Andreae 1995 — Andreae B (ed.). *Museo Chiaramonti.* Berlin, 1995.

Andreae 1996 — Andreae B. 'I gruppi di Polifemo e di Scilla a Villa Adriana.' In *Ulisse: il mito e la memoria* 342-345. (Exhibition catalogue). Rome, 1996.

Andreae 1999 — Andreae B. *Odysseus: Mythos und Erinnerung.* Mainz, 1999.

Andreae and Ortega 1989 — Andreae B and Ortega A. 'Nuove richerche a Villa Adriana.' *RendPontAcc* 62 (1989-90) 67-103.

Andrén 1980 — Andrén A. *Capri from the Stone Age to the Tourist Age.* Gothenburg, 1980.

Angelicoussis 1992 — Angelicoussis E. *Corpus signorum imperii Romani. Vol. 3 Fas. 3 The Woburn Abbey collection of classical antiquities.* Mainz am Rhein, 1992.

Antonini 1821 — Antonini C. *Manuale di vari ornamenti componenti la serie de vasi antichi esistenti in Roma e fuori* (ecc). Rome, 1821.

Ashby 1908 — Ashby T. 'The Villa d'Este at Tivoli and the Collection of Classical Sculpture which it contained.' *Archaeologia* 61 (1908) 219-256.

Ashby 1935 — Ashby T. *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*. Oxford, 1935.

Ashmole 1929 — Ashmole B. *A catalogue of the ancient marbles at Ince Blundell Hall*. Oxford, 1929.

Aurigemma 1954 — Aurigemma S. 'Lavori nel Canopo de Villa Adriana'. *BdA* 39 (1954) 327-341.

Aurigemma 1955 — Aurigemma S. 'Lavori nel Canopo de Villa Adriana II'. *BdA* 40 (1955) 64-78.

Aurigemma 1956 — Aurigemma S. 'Lavori nel Canopo de Villa Adriana III'. *BdA* 41 (1956) 57-71.

Aurigemma 1958 — Aurigemma S. 'L'aspetto architettonico del Canopo di Villa Adriana.' *Palladio. Rivista di storia dell'architettura 8* (1958) 49-68.

Aurigemma 1961 — Aurigemma S. *Villa Adriana*. Rome, 1961.

Aurigemma and de Santis 1955 — Aurigemma S and de Santis A. *Gaeta, Formia, Minturno*. Rome, 1955.

Baldassari 1989 — Baldassari P. 'L'opera grafica di Agostino Penna sulla Villa Adriana (Mss. Lanciani 138)'. = *RivIstArch* 11 (1989).

Ball 1994 — Ball L F. 'A reappraisal of Nero's Domus Aurea'. In Humphrey J (ed.) *Rome Papers: the Baths of Trajan Decius, Iside e Serapide nel Palazzo, a late Domus on the Palatine, and Nero's Golden House* 182-254. Ann Arbor, 1994. (=*JRA* Supp.Series 11).

Barbet and Miniero 1999 — Barbet A and Miniero P (eds.). *La Villa San Marco a Stabia.* Naples, 1999.

Barosso 1940 — Barosso M. 'Edificio romano sotto il tempio di Venere e Roma.' In *Saggi sull'architettura etrusca e romana* (= *Atti III Convegno nazionale di storia dell'architettura*) 75-78. Rome, 1940.

Bartmann 1988 — Bartmann E. 'Decor et duplicatio: Pendants in Roman Sculptural Display'. *AJA* 92 (1988) 211-225.

Bartmann 1991 — Bartmann E. 'Sculptural Collecting and Display in the Private Realm'. In Gazda E K (ed.) *Roman Art in the Private Sphere* 71-78. Ann Arbor, 1991.

Bek 1980 — Bek L. 'Towards Paradise on Earth'. Odense, 1980. (=*AnalRom* Supp. 9).

Bek 1983 — Bek L. 'Questiones Conviviales: The idea of the triclinium and the staging of convivial ceremony from Rome to Byzantium'. *AnalRom* 13 (1983) 81-107.

Belli Pasqua 1995 — Belli Pasqua R. *Sculture di età romana in 'basalto'.* Rome, 1995.

Bencivenga et al. 1979 — Bencivenga C; Fergola L; Melillo L. 'Ricerche sulla villa romana di Minori'. *AION (Sezione di archeologia e storia antica)* 1 (1979) 131-151.

Bergmann 1995 — Bergmann B. 'Visualising Pliny's Villas.' *JRA* 8 (1995) 406-420.

Bieber 1977 — Bieber M. *Ancient copies: contributions to the history of Greek and Roman art.* New York, 1977.

Bignamini 1996 — Bignamini I. 'I marmi Fagan in Vaticano. La vendita del 1804 e altre acquisizioni.' *BMonMusPont* 16 (1996) 331-394.

Birley 1997 — Birley A. *Hadrian: the restless Emperor.* London, 1997.

Bizarri Vivarelli 1976 — Bizarri Vivarelli D. 'Un ninfeo sotto il parco di Traiano'. *MEFRA* 88 (1976) 719-757.

Blake and Taylor 1973 — Blake M E and Taylor D T. *Roman Construction in Italy from Nerva through the Antonines.* Philadelphia, 1973.

Bloch 1947 — Bloch H. *I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana: contributi all'archeologia e alla storia romana.* Rome, 1947.

Blondel 1881 — Blondel P. 'Restauration du prétendu Théâtre Maritime de la Villa d'Adrien'. *MEFRA* I (1881) 63-67.

Boatwright 1987 — Boatwright M T. *Hadrian and the city of Rome.* Princeton N J, 1987.

Boatwright 2000 — Boatwright M T. *Hadrian and the cities of the Empire.* Princeton N J, 2000.

Bodel 1997 — Bodel J. 'Monumental villas and villa monuments.' *JRA* 10 (1997) 5-35.

Bodon 1994 — Bodon G. 'Un elemento di fontana a labrum presso il Museo Civico Archeologico di Padova.' *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova* 83 (1994) 39-55.

Boeckler 1664 — Boeckler G A. *Architectura curiosa nova.* Nuremburg, 1664.

Bol 1989-98 — Bol P C (ed.) *Forschungen zur Villa Albani: Katalog der antiken Bildwerke.* Berlin, 1989-1998 (5 vols.).

Borghini 1989 — Borghini G (ed.) *Marmi antichi.* Rome, 1989.

Borgia 1991 — Borgia E. 'Gli Hospitalia'. *Bollettino di archeologia* 8 (1991) 73-83.

Börker 1973 — Börker C. 'Neuattisches und Pergamenisches an den Ara-Pacis Ranken.' *Jdl* 88 (1973) 283-317.

Borriello 1996 — Borriello M (ed.) *Pompei: abitare sotto il Vesuvio.* Ferrara, 1996.

Borriello and D'Ambrosio 1979 — Borriello M R and D'Ambrosio A. *Baiae-Misenum. Forma Italiae Regio 1.14.* Florence, 1979.

Bottari 1750-82 — Bottari G G. *Musei Capitolini.* Rome, 1750-82 (4 vols.).

Botti and Romanelli 1951 — Botti G and Romanelli P. *Le sculture del Museo gregoriano egizio.* Città del Vaticano, 1951.

Bouillon 1821 — Bouillon P. *Musée des antiques.* Paris, ?1821.

Boussois and Martin 1913 — Boussois M and Martin J. 'Fouilles exécutées par M Boussois à la Villa d'Hadrién'. *MEFRA* 33 (1913) 261-265.

Brown 1965 — Brown F E. 'Hadrianic architecture'. In Sandler L F (ed.) *Essays in memory of Karl Lehmann* 55-58. New York, 1965.

Bulgarini 1848 — Bulgarini F. *Notizie Storiche antiquarie statistiche e agronomiche intorno all'antichisissima città di Tivoli e suo territorio.* Rome, 1848.

Canina 1848-56 — Canina L. *Gli edifizii di Roma antica cogniti per alcune reliquie.* Rome, 1848-56 (6 vols.).

Caprino 1996 — Caprino C. 'Plastico marmoreo di uno stadio nella Villa Adriana a Tivoli'. *RivIstArch* Series.III 19-20 (1996-97) 113-151.

Carettoni 1949 — Carettoni G. 'ROMA (Palatino). –Costruzioni sotto l'angolo sud-occidentale della Domus Flavia (triclinio e ninfeo occidentale).' *NSc* (1949) 48-79.

Cassatella 1986 — Cassatella A. 'Antiquario Palatino. Fasi edilizie sotto l'ex Convento della Visitazione.' *BullCom* 91 (1986) 535-539.

Cassatella 1998 — Cassatella A. 'Roma. Domus Aurea sul Palatino.' *Journal of Ancient Topography* 8 (1998) 273-284.

Caylus 1752-67 — Caylus Comte de. *Recueil d'Antiquités Égyptiennes, Étrusques, Grecques, Romaines* (etc). Paris, 1752-1767 (7 vols.).

Ceccarini and Uncini 1990 — Ceccarini T and Uncini A. 'Antiquari a Roma nel primo Ottocento: Ignazio e Luigi Vescovali.' *BMonMusPont* 10 (1990) 115-186.

Chiarucci 1989 — Chiarucci P. *Anzio archeologica.* Anzio, 1989.

Chierici 1875 — Chierici G. *Antichi monumenti della Pianosa*. Reggio Emilia, 1875.

Chillman 1924 — Chillman J. 'The Casino of the Semicircular Arcades at the Tiburtine Villa of the Emperor Hadrian.' *MAAR* 4 (1924) 103-120.

Ciccone 1995 — Ciccone S. 'La sala ottagona della 'Domus Aurea' a Roma: il prototipo in un ninfeo di Formia.' In *Formianum: atti del Convegno di studi sull'antico territorio di Formia III* 9-24. Minturno, 1995.

Cifarelli 1995 — Cifarelli F M. 'Un ninfeo repubblicano a segni con la firma di Q. Mutius architetto.' In *Tra Lazio e Campania: ricerche di storia e di topografia antica* 159-188. Naples, 1995. (= Quaderni del Dipartimento di scienze dell'antichità, Università degli studi di Salerno 16 Serie Storia antica e Archeologia).

Clarac 1841-53 — Clarac F Comte de. *Musée de sculpture antique et moderne (etc)*. Paris, 1841-53 (12 vols.).

Clarke 1991 — Clarke J R. *The houses of Roman Italy 100BC-AD250*. London, 1991.

Coarelli 1981 — Coarelli F. *Roma*. Rome, 1981.

Coarelli 1982 — Coarelli F. *Lazio*. Rome, 1982.

Coarelli 1996 — Coarelli F. 'Delta. Cesare, Iside e 'il nilo' del Campo Marzio'. *StMisc* 30 (1991-92) 191-195. (= *Studi in memoria di Lucia Guerrini*. Rome, 1996).

Coarelli 1997 — Coarelli F. 'Il 'Pecile' di Villa Adriana e la *porticus triumphi*.' *RM* 104 (1997) 201-217.

Coffin 1960 — Coffin D R. *The Villa d'Este at Tivoli.* Princeton, 1960.

Cohon 1984 — Cohon R. *Greek and Roman stone table supports.* PhD dissertation, New York, 1984.

Coleman 1993 — Coleman K M. 'Launching into history: Aquatic Displays in the Early Empire'. *JRS* 83 (1993) 48-74.

Collezioni Napoli 1986-89 — *Le Collezioni del Museo Nazionale di Napoli.* Rome, 1986-1989 (2 vols.).

Conti 1970 — Conti G. *Decorazione architettonica della 'Piazza d'Oro' a Villa Adriana.* Rome, 1970 (= *Studia archaeologica* 13).

Conticello 1976 — Conticello B. 'Di un putto marmoreo del museo di Sperlonga'. *RM* 83 (1976) 311-317.

Conticello and Andreae 1974 — Conticello B and Andreae B. 'Die Skulpturen von Sperlonga'. *AntP* 14 (1974).

Correspondance 1887-1912 — *Correspondance des Directeurs de l'Académie de France à Rome (etc).* Paris, 1887-1912 (18 vols.).

Cozza 1952 — Cozza L. 'ROMA (Via Anagnina, vocabolo <Centroni Grotte>). - <Natatio> nell'antica villa detta <dei Centroni>.' *NSc* (1952) 257-283. Water features Natatio

Cozza 1974 — Cozza L. 'I recenti scavi delle Sette Sale.' *RendPontAcc* 47 (1974-75) 89-92.

Crema 1959 — Crema L. *L'architettura romana.* Turin, 1959.

Croze-Magnan 1803-1809 — Croze-Magnan S C. *Le Musée Français, recueil complet des tableaux, statues et bas-reliefs (etc).* Paris, 1803-1809 (4 vols.).

Cunliffe 1971 — Cunliffe B. *Roman Bath discovered.* London, 1971.

Cuscito 1968 — Cuscito G. 'Le Fontanine zampillanti di Aquileia.' In *Aquilea: 45 congres, 15 setembar 1968* 274-284. Udine, 1968.

Da Milano et al. 1992 — Da Milano C, Ferrera L B, and Macchi M. 'Tivoli (Roma). Villa Adriana'. *Bollettino di Archeologia* 16-18 (1992) 73-106.

D'Amore et al. 1983 — D'Amore L, Allroggen-Bedel A, Barbet A et al., Blanc N, Pisapia M S, and Miniero P. 'Premier rapport sur l'étude de la Villa San Marco à Stabies'. *MEFRA* 95/2 (1983) 909-936.

D'Arms 1970 — D'Arms J H. *Romans on the Bay of Naples*. Cambridge, Mass., 1970.

D'Arms 1994 — D'Arms J H. 'Control, companionship and *clientela*: some social functions of the Roman communal meal'. *EchCl* 28 (1984) 327-348.

Darwall Smith 1996 — Darwall Smith R H. *Emperors and architecture: a study of Flavian Rome.* Brussels, 1996. (= *Collection Latomus* 231).

Das Wrack 1994 — Hellenkemper Salies G, von Prittwitz H-H, Bauchhenss G and G (eds.). *Das Wrack: die antike Schiffsfund von Mahdia.* Cologne, 1994.

De Caro 1976 — De Caro S. 'Sculture della Villa di Poppaea in Oplontis.' *CronPomp* 2 (1976) 184-225.

De Caro 1987 — De Caro S. 'The Sculptures of the Villa of Poppaea at Oplontis: A Preliminary Report.' In MacDougall E B (ed.) *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens* 17-133. Washington DC, 1987.

De Caro 2002 — De Caro S. *I campi flegrei, ischia, vivara storia e Archeologia.* Naples, 2002.

De Fine Licht 1974 — De Fine Licht K. 'Antrum Albanum. Report on a measurement survey conducted at Ninfeo Bergantino near Castelgandolfo.' *AnalRom* 7 (1974) 37-66.

De Fine Licht 1990 — De Fine Licht K. *Untersuchungen an den Trajansthermen su Rom. 2: Sette Sale.* Rome, 1990. (= *AnalRom* Supp. 19)

De Franceschini 1991 — De Franceschini M. *Villa Adriana: Mosaici-pavimenti-edifici.* Rome, 1991.

De Lachenal 1976 — De Lachenal L. 'Sul gruppo della Scilla d'Anzio: considerazioni e tentativi di ricostruzione'. *RendPontAcc* 49 (1976-77) 93-116

DeLaine 1997 — DeLaine J. *The Baths of Caracalla: a study in the design, construction, and economics of large-scale building projects in imperial Rome. JRA* Supp. 25 (1997)

Della Corte 1921 — Della Corte M. 'La 'Villa rustica N Popidi Flori' esplorata dalla signora Giovanna Zurlo-Pulzella, nel fondo di sua proprietà in contrada Pisanella. Comune di Boscoreale, l'anno 1906.' *NSc* (1921) 442-460.

Del Re 1611 — Del Re A. *Dell'antichità tiburtine capitolo V.* Rome, 1611.

D'Este 1864 — D'Este A. *Memoire di Antonio Canova.* Florence, 1864.

De Vos 1983 — De Vos M. 'Funzione e decorazione dell'Auditorium de Mecenate.' In *L'archeologia in Roma capitale tra sterro e scavo 1870-1911* 231-247. Vicenza, 1983.

De Vos 1994 — De Vos M. 'Late Republican and Flavian wall mosaic in the Horti Sallustiani (Rome).' In *VI Colloquio Internacional sobre Mosaico Antiguo, Palencia-Mérida, Octubre 1990* 91-96. Guadalajara, 1994.

De Vos 1997 — De Vos M. *Dionysus, Hylas e Isis sui monti di Roma tre monumenti con decorazione parietale in Roma antica (Palatino, Quirinale, Oppio).* Rome, 1997.

Dietrich 1911 — Dietrich A. 'Der Ritus der verhüllten Hände'. In *Kleine Schriften* 440-448. Leipzig, 1911.

Di Mento 2000 — Di Mento M. 'Villa Adriana: Il criptoportico e la galleria di servizio delle grandi terme.' *Atti e memorie della Società Tiburtina di storia e d'arte* 73 (2000) 37-62.

Documenti inediti 1878-80 — *Documenti inediti per servire alla storia dei Musei d'Italia.* Rome, 1878-1880 (4 vols.).

Dunbabin 1991 — Dunbabin K M D. 'Triclinium and Stibadium.' In Slater W J (ed.) *Dining in a Classical Context* 121-148. Ann Arbor, 1991.

Dunbabin 1996 — Dunbabin K M D. 'Convivial spaces: dining and entertainment in the Roman villa.' *JRA* 9 (1996) 66-80.

Dunbabin 1999 — Dunbabin K M D. *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World.* Cambridge, 1999.

Du Prey 1994 — De la Ruffinière du Prey P. *The villas of Pliny from antiquity to posterity.* Chicago, 1994.

Dwyer 1982 — Dwyer E J. *Pompeian domestic sculpture: a study of five Pompeian houses and their contents.* Rome, 1982.

Dwyer 1991 — Dwyer E J. 'The Pompeian atrium house in theory and in practice.' In Gazda E K (ed.) *Roman Art in the Private Sphere* 25-48. Ann Arbor, 1991.

Ehrlich — Ehrlich T L. 'The Waterworks of Hadrian's Villa.' *JGH* 9.4 (1989) 161-176.

Ensoli Vittozzi 1990 — Ensoli Vittozzi S. *Musei Capitolini: la collezione egizia.* Rome, 1990.

Eschebach 1982 — Eschebach H. 'Katalog der pompejanischen Laufbrunnen und ihre Reliefs'. *AntW* 13.3 (1982) 21-26.

Fabbrini 1982 — Fabbrini L. 'Domus Aurea. Il piano superiore del quartiere orientale.' *MemPontAcc* 14 (1982) 5-24.

Farrar 1996 — Farrar L. *Gardens of Italy and the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire from the 4th century BC to the 4th century AD.* Oxford, 1996. (=*BAR International Series* 650)

Farrar 1998 — Farrar L. *Ancient Roman Gardens.* Stroud, 1998.

Fea 1790-1836 — Fea C D F I (ed.). *Miscellanea filologica, critica, e antiquaria.* Rome, 1790-1836 (2 vols.).

Filippi 2001 — Filippi F (ed.). *Archeologia e giubileo: gli interventi a Roma e nel Lazio nel piano per il Grande Giubileo del 2000.* Naples, 2001.

Fiorelli 1878a — Fiorelli G. 'Notizie degli scavi di antichità comunicate dal socio G Fiorelli nella seduta del 17 febbraio 1878.' *NSc* (1878) 300-340.

Fiorelli 1878b — Fiorelli G. 'Notizie degli scavi di antichità comunicate dal socio G Fiorelli nella seduta del 19 maggio 1878.' *NSc* (1878) 551-621.

Fiorelli 1880 — Fiorelli G. 'Notizie degli scavi di antichità comunicate dal socio G Fiorelli nella seduta del 16 gennaio 1881. *NSc* (1880) 456-504.

Fontaniere 1725 — Author 'Fontaniere' of the Villa d'Este. *Descrizione della R Villa d'Este in Tivoli.* MS dated 1725, held at the British School at Rome, Ashby Archive.

Förtsch 1993 — Förtsch R. *Archäologischer Kommentar zu den Villenbriefen des jüngeren Plinius*. Mainz, 1993.

Franciosa 1976 — Franciosa N. *La Villa Romaine de Minori*. Salerno, 1976.

Frazer 1996 — Frazer A K. 'Hadrian's Teatro Marittimo at Tivoli, and Pantheon'. In Striker C L (ed.) *Architectural studies in memory of Richard Krautheimer* 77-78. Mainz, 1996.

Gabucci 1999 — Gabucci A (ed.). *Il Colosseo*. Milan, 1999.

Galliazzo 1979 — Galliazzo V. 'Significato e funzione della fontanella a scalete d'acqua nella casa Romana'. *Atti dell'Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati* VI 19 (1979) 49-82.

Gasparri 1980 — Gasparri C. 'Materiali per servire allo studio del Museo Torlonia.' *MemLinc* ser.8 v.24 fasc.2 (1980) 37-238.

Gasparri 1996 — Gasparri C. '*Prosopa* e *personae.* Maschere teatrali in marmo nella decorazione architettonica di età adrianea.' *StMisc* 30 (1991-92) 235-259. (= *Studi in memoria di Lucia Guerrini.* Rome, 1996).

Gasparri 1998 — Gasparri C. 'Il ciclo di maschera del Cortile delle Statue'. In *Il Cortile delle Statue; der Statuenhof des Belvedere im Vatikan* 327-337. Mainz 1998.

Geominy 1990 — Geominy W. 'Die Niobiden der Villa Adriana.' In Akten *des XIII Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie, Berlin 1988* 379-380. Mainz am Rhein, 1990.

George 1997 — George M. *The Roman domestic architecture of northern Italy.* Oxford, 1997.

George 1998 — George M. 'Elements of the peristyle in Campanian *atria.*' *JRA* 11 (1998) 82-100.

Gerhard and Panofka 1828 — Gerhard E and Panofka T. *Neapels antike Bildwerke.* Stuttgart, 1828.

Geschwantler and Oberleitner 1974 — Geschwantler G and Oberleitner W. *Götter, Heroen, Menschen: antikes Leben im Spiegel der Kunst.* Vienna, 1974.

Gibson et al. 1994 — Gibson S, DeLaine J, and Claridge A. 'The Triclinium of the Domus Flavia'. *PBSR* 62 (1994) 67-97.

Gieré 1986 — Gieré A. *Hippodromus und Xystus: Untersuchungen zu römischen Gartenformen.* Zurich, 1986.

Ginouvès 1969 — Ginouvès R. 'Le nymphée de Laodicée et les nymphées romains'. In *Laodicée du Lycos: le nymphée; campagnes 1961-1963* 136-174. Quebec, 1969.

Giubilei 1990 — Giubilei A. 'Villa Adriana: il cosidetto edificio con triplice esedra.' *BdA* Ser. VI 75 (1990) 47-58.

Giubilei 1995 — Giubilei A. 'Il conte Fede e la Villa Adriana: storia di una collezione d'arte'. *Atti e memorie della Società Tiburtina di storia e d'arte* 68 (1995) 81-147.

Giuilani 1966 — Giuliani C F. *Tibur pars altera. Forma Italiae I 3.* Rome, 1966.

Giuliani 1970 — Giuliani C F. *Tibur pars prima. Forma Italiae I 7.* Rome, 1970.

Giuliani 1973 — Giuliani C F. 'Contributi allo studio della tipologia dei portici'. In *Les Cryptoportiques dans l'architecture romaine* 219-248. Paris, 1973.

Giuliani 1975 — Giuliani C F. 'Il lato nord ovest della Piazza d'Oro.' *QITA* VIII (1975) 3-53.

Giuliani 1982 — Giuliani C F. 'Note sull'architettura delle residenze imperiali dal I al III secolo d.Cr.' *ANRW* II 12.1 (1982) 233-258.

Giuliani 1988 — Giuiliani C F. 'La Villa'. In Giuliano A (ed) Villa *Adriana* 71-147. Rome, 1988.

Giuliani 1999 — Giuliani C F. 'Differenze qualitative fra strutture urbane e periferiche nel ninfeo del cortile delle biblioteche a Villa Adriana.' In *La forma della città e del territorio: esperienze metodologiche e risultati a confronto: atti dell'incontro di studio, S.Maria Capua Vetere 27-28 Novembre 1998* 61-73. Rome, 1999.

Glaser 1987 — Glaser F. 'Brunnen und Nymphäen.' In *Die Wasserversorgung antiker Städte* Vol 2 103-131. Mainz, 1987.

Glaser 2000 — 'Fountains and nymphaea.' In Wikander Ö (ed.) Handbook *of ancient water technology* 413-452. Leiden, 2000.

Grassinger 1991 — Grassinger D. *Römische Marmorkratere*. Mainz am Rhein, 1991.

Grenier 1989 — Grenier J-C. 'La decoration statuaire du 'Serapaeum' du 'Canope' de la Villa Adriana'. *MEFRA* 101 (1989) 925-1019.

Grimal 1969 — Grimal P. *Les Jardins Romains*. Paris, 1969.

Grimal and Guey 1937 — Grimal P and Guey J. 'À propos des 'Bains de Livie' au Palatin.' *MEFRA* 54 (1937) 142-164.

Gros 1996 — Gros P. *L'architecture romaine: du début du IIIe siècle av. J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire. 1. Les monuments publiques*. Paris, 1996.

Grummond and Ridgway 2000 — Grummond N T and Ridgway B S (eds.). *From Pergamum to Sperlonga*. Berkeley, 2000.

Guaitoli and Giuliani 1972 — Guaitoli M and Giuliani C F. 'Il ninfeo minore della villa detta di Cicerone a Formia.' *RM* 79 (1972) 191-219.

Guattani 1805 — Guattani G A. *Roma descritta ed illustrata*. Rome, 1805.

Guidobaldi 1994 — Guidobaldi F (ed.). *Sectilia pavimenta di Villa Adriana.* Rome, 1994.

Gukovsky 1963 — Gukovsky M A. 'Ritrovamento dei tre volumi di disegni attribuiti a Fra Giocondo.' *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 6 1(1963) 263-269.

Günther 1913 — Günther R T. *Pausilypon, the imperial villa near Naples.* Oxford, 1913.

Gusman 1904 — Gusman P. *La Villa impériale de Tibur.* Paris, 1904.

Gusman 1910 — Gusman P. *L'art decoratif de Rome de la fin de la république au IVe siècle.* Paris, 1910.

Hadrien 1999 — *Hadrien: trésors d'une villa impériale.* (Exhibition catalogue). Paris, 1999.

Hallam 1931 — Hallam G H. ' Notes on the cult of Hercules Victor in Tibur and its neighbourhood'. *JRS* 21 (1931) 276-282.

Hannestad 1982 — Hannestad N. 'Über das Grabmal des Antinoos.' *AnalRom* 11 (1982) 69-108.

Hansen 1960 — Hansen E. 'La Piazza d'Oro e la sua cupola'. Copenhagen, 1960. (=*AnalRom* Supp.1).

Hansen 2000 — Hansen E. 'Il Belvedere dell'Accademia della Villa Adriana.' In *Damarato: studi di antichità classica offerta a Paola Pelagatti* 387-398. Milan, 2000.

Harris 1972 — Harris H A. *Sport in Greece and Rome.* London, 1972.

Haselberger 1997 — Haselberger L. 'Architectural Likenesses: models and plans of architecture in classical antiquity'. *JRA* 10 (1997) 77-94.

Haskell and Penny 1981 — Haskell F and Penny N. *Taste and the antique: the lure of classical sculpture, 1500-1900.* New Haven, 1981.

Helbig 1912-17 — Helbig W. *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom.* Leipzig, 1912-1913 (2 vols.).

Helbig 1963-72 — Helbig W. *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom.* Tübingen, 1963-1972 (4 vols.).

Hirschfeld 1913 — Hirschfeld O. *Kleine Schriften.* Berlin, 1913.

Higginbotham 1997 — Higginbotham J. *Piscinae; artificial fishponds in Roman Italy.* Chapel Hill, 1997.

Hilgers 1969 — Hilgers W. *Lateinische Gefäßnamen: Bezeichnungen Funktion und Form römische Gefäße nach den antiken Schriftquellen.* Düsseldorf, 1969.

Hill 1974 — Hill D K. 'Nymphs and fountains'. *AK* 17 (1974) 107-108.

Hill 1981 — Hill D K. 'Some Sculpture from Roman Domestic Gardens.' In MacDougall E B and Jashemski W F (eds.) *Ancient Roman Gardens* 83-94. Dumbarton Oaks, 1981.

Hitzig and Blümner 1896 — Hitzig H and Blümner H. *Commentary on Pausanias.* Berlin, 1896.

Hoffmann 1980 — Hoffmann A. *Das Gartenstadion in der Villa Adriana.* Mainz, 1980. (=Deutsches archäologisches Institut Rom, Sonderschriften 4).

Hornbostel-Hüttner 1979 — Hornbostel-Hüttner G. *Studien zur römischen Nischenarchitecktur.* Leiden, 1979. (=Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society IX).

Horti Lamiani 1986 — Cima M and La Rocca E (eds.). *Le tranquille dimore degli dei. La residenza imperiale degli Horti Lamiani.* Venezia, 1986.

Hülsen 1917 — Hülsen C. *Römische antikengarten des XVI Jahrhunderts.* Heidelberg, 1917. (=*Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Stiftung Heinrich Lanz. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse.* 4.)

Hülsen 1919 — Hülsen C. 'Der kleinere Palast in der Villa des Hadrian bei Tivoli.' *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse.* 13).

Humphrey 1986 — Humphrey J. *Roman Circuses.* London, 1986.

Iacopi G 1963 — Iacopi G. *L'antro di Tiberio a Sperlonga.* Rome, 1963.

Iacopi I 1999 — Iacopi I. *Domus Aurea.* Milan, 1999.

Ingamells 1997 — Ingamells J. *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1701-1800.* London, 1997.

Jacobson 1986 — Jacobson D M. 'Hadrianic Architecture and Geometry'. *AJA* 90.1 (1986) 69-85.

Jacques 1902 — Jacques P. *L'album de Pierre Jacques, sculpteur de Reims, dessiné à Rome de 1572 à 1577.* Reinach S (ed.). Paris, 1902.

Jashemski 1979-1993 — Jashemski W F. *The Gardens of Pompeii, Herculaneum and the Villas destroyed by Vesuvius.* New Rochelle, 1979-1993 (2 vols.).

Jashemski 1987 — Jashemski W F and Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'I giardini di Villa Adriana: rapporto preliminare'. *RendPontAcc* 60 (1987-88) 145-169.

Jashemski 1992 — Jashemski W F and Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Preliminary Excavations in the Gardens of Hadrian's Villa: The Canopus Area and the Piazza d'Oro'. *AJA* 96 (1992) 579-597.

Jenkins and Sloan 1996 — Jenkins I and Sloan K. *Vases and Volcanoes. Sir William Hamilton and his collection.* London, 1996.

Jones H S 1912-26 — Jones H S (ed.). *A catalogue of the ancient sculptures preserved in the municipal collections of Rome.* Oxford, 1912-26 (2 vols.).

Jones C P 1991 — Jones C P. 'Dinner Theater'. In Slater W J (ed.) *Dining in a Classical Context* 185-198. Ann Arbor, 1991.

Joyce 1981 — Joyce H. *The decoration of walls, ceilings, and floors in Italy in the second and third centuries AD.* Rome, 1981.

Joyce 1990 — Joyce H. 'Hadrian's Villa and the Dome of Heaven'. *RM* 97 (1990) 347-381.

Kähler 1950 — Kähler H. *Hadrian und seine Villa bei Tivoli.* Berlin, 1950.

Kapossy 1967 — Kapossy B. 'Zwei Anlagen der Villa Adriana.' *Gymnasium* 74 (1967) 34-45.

Kapossy 1969 — Kapossy B. *Brunnenfiguren der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit.* Zurich, 1969.

Kaschnitz von Weinberg 1936-7 — Kaschnitz von Weinberg G. *Sculture del magazzino del Museo Vaticano.* Città del Vaticano, 1936-7 (2 vols.).

Kelso and Baramki 1949 — Kelso J L and Baramki D C. 'Excavations at New Testament Jericho and Khirbet en Nitla.' *AASOR* 29-30 (1949-51) 15-17.

Klementa 1993 — Klementa S. *Gelagerte Flussgötter des Späthellenismus und der römischen Kaiserzeit.* Cologne, 1993.

Kockel and Weber 1983 — Kockel V and Weber B F. 'Die Villa delle Colonne a mosaico in Pompeji.' *RM* 90 (1983) 51-89.

Kuttner 1999 — Kuttner A. 'Looking outside inside: ancient Roman garden rooms.' *Studies in the history of gardens and designed landscapes* 19.1 (1999) 7-35.

Lafon 1998 — Lafon X. 'Piscinae et pisciculture dans le basin occidental de la Méditerranée'. *JRA* 11 (1998) 574-582.

Lanciani 1901 — Lanciani R. *The destruction of ancient Rome: a sketch of the history of the monuments.* London, 1901.

Lanciani 1906 — Lanciani R. *Villa Adriana.* Rome, 1906.

Lanciani 1980 — Lanciani R. *I commentarii di Frontino intorno le acque e gli aquedotti.* Rome, 1980

Lanciani 1989-2000 — Lanciani R. *Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno le collezioni romane di antichità.* Rome, 1989-2000 (5 vols.).

La Rocca 1986 — La Rocca E. 'Il lusso come espressione di potere'. In Cima M and La Rocca E (eds.) *Le tranquille dimore degli dei: la residenza imperiale degli Horti Lamiani* 3-35. Venice, 1986

La Rocca 2001 — La Rocca E. 'La nuova immagine dei fori Imperiali. Appunti in margine agli scavi.' *RM* 108 (2001) 171-213.

Lattimore 1976 — Lattimore S. *The marine thiasos in Greek sculpture.* Los Angeles, 1976.

Lavagne 1973a — Lavagne H. 'Villa d'Hadrien: La mosaique de voûte du cryptoportique républicain et les débuts de l'Opus Musium' en Italie'. *MEFRA* 85 (1973) 197-245.

Lavagne 1973b — Lavagne H. ''Utilitas-decor': Le cryptoportique républicain de la Villa d'Hadrien.' In *Les Cryptoportiques dans l'architecture romaine* 167-183. Paris, 1973.

Lavagne 1988 — Lavagne H. *Operosa Antra. Recherches sur la grotte à Rome de Sylla à Hadrien.* Paris, 1988.

Lavagne 1990 — Lavagne H. 'Ninfei e fontane.' In Settis S (ed.) *Civiltà dei Romani: Vol. 1 La città, il territorio, l'impero* 125-138. Rome, 1990.

Lavagne 1993 — Lavagne H. 'Une peinture romaine oubliée: le paysage du nymphée découvert au Palais Barberini en 1627'. *MEFRA* 104 (1993) 747-777.

Lavagne 1998 — Lavagne H. 'Fonticuli - deux fontaines à escaliers d'eau en Narbonnaise.' *RÉA* 100 (1998) 269-287.

Lavagne and Wattel De Croizant 1984 — Lavagne H and Wattel De Croizant O. 'De la villa de San Marco (Stabies) au Musée Condé (Chantilly)'. *MEFRA* 96 (1984) 739-788.

Lehmann 1953 — Lehmann P W. *Roman wall paintings from Boscoreale in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.* Cambridge, 1953.

Lehmann-Hartleben and Lindros 1935 — Lehmann-Hartleben K and Lindros J. 'Il palazzo degli Horti Sallustiani'. *OpArch* 1.2 (1935) 196-227.

Lembke 1994 — Lembke K. *Das Iseum Campense in Rom: Studie über den Isiskult unter Domitian.* Heidelberg, 1994.

Leppert 1974 — Leppert M. *23 Kaiservillen, Vorarbeiten zu Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte der Villegiatur der hohen Kaiserzeit.* PhD dissertation, Freiburg University, 1974.

Letzner 1999 — Letzner W. *Römische Brunnen und Nymphaea in der westlichen Reichshälfte.* Münster, 1999.

Ligorio Trattato — Ligorio P. *Trattato dell'antichità di Tivoli e della Villa Adriana fatto da Pirro Ligorio* (ecc). British Library MS Add. 22001 (date not specified).

Ligorio and Contini 1751 — Ligorio P and Contini F. *Pianta della Villa Tiburtina di Adriano Cesare.* Rome, 1751.

LIMC — *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae.* Zürich & Munich, 1981-1999.

Ling 1977 — Ling R J. 'Stucco decorations at Baia'. *PBSR* 45 (1977) 39.

Ling 1991 — Ling R J. *Roman Painting*. Cambridge, 1991.

Liverani 1989 — Liverani P. *L'Antiquarium de Villa Barberini a Castel Gandolfo*. Vatican, 1989.

Locatelli 1750 — Locatelli G. *Museo Capitolino, o sia descrizione delle statue, busti, bassirilievi (ecc.)* Rome, 1750.

Lolli Ghetti 1987 — Lolli Ghetti M. 'Tivoli - Villa Adriana: il nuovo Museo Didattico - Centro Visitatori.' *Quaderni del Centro di studio per l'archaeologia l'Etrusco-Italia* 14 (1987) 173-178.

Lolli Ghetti 1997 — Lolli Ghetti M. 'Conservazione e riproprosizione Villa Adriana - Due esempi'. In *La reintegrazione nel restauro dell'antico: la protezione del patrimonio dal rischio sismico: atti del seminario di studi, Paestum 11-12 aprile 1997* 141-154. Rome, 1997.

LTUR — Steinby E M (ed.). *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*. Rome, 1993-2000 (6 vols.).

Lugli 1913 — Lugli G. 'Lo scavo fatto nel 1841 nel ninfeo detto Bergantino sulla riva del lago Albano'. *BullCom* 41 (1913) 89-148.

Lugli 1920 — Lugli G. 'La villa di Domiziano sui colli Albani.' *BullCom* 48 (1920) 3-69.

Lugli 1926 — Lugli G. 'La villa Sabina di Orazio.' *MonAnt* 31 (1926) 456-590.

Lugli 1927 — Lugli G. 'Villa Adriana. Una villa di età repubblicana inclusa nelle costruzioni imperiali'. *BullCom* 55 (1927) 139-204.

Lugli 1928 — Lugli G. *Forma Italiae: Regio I Latium e Campania II Circeo.* Rome, 1928.

Lugli 1932 — Lugli G. 'Villa Adriana. Le fasi della villa da Adriano al tardo impero'. *BullCom* 60 (1932) 111-150.

Lugli 1938 — Lugli G. 'Nymphaea sive musaea'. In Galassi Paluzzi G (ed.) Atti *del IV Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* 155-168. Rome, 1938.

Lugli 1940 — Lugli G. 'La 'Roccabruna' della Villa Adriana'. *Palladio* 4 (1940) 257-274.

Lugli 1946 — Lugli G. *Roma Antica.* Rome, 1946.

Lugli 1965 — Lugli G. *Studi Minori di topografia antica.* Rome, 1965.

Lugli 1968 — Lugli G. *Nero's Golden House and the Trajan Baths.* Rome, 1968.

MacDonald 1982 — MacDonald W L. *The architecture of the Roman Empire 1.* Yale, 1982 (revised).

MacDonald 1986 — MacDonald W L. *The architecture of the Roman Empire II.* Yale, 1986.

MacDonald 1993 — MacDonald W L. 'Hadrian's Circles'. *SHA* 43 (1993) 394-408.

MacDonald and Boyle 1980 — MacDonald W L and Boyle B M. 'The Small Baths at Hadrian's Villa'. *Journal of Society of Architectural Historians* 39.1 (1980) 5-27.

MacDonald and Pinto 1995 — MacDonald W L and Pinto J A. *Hadrian's Villa and Its Legacy.* New Haven and London, 1995.

Maiuri A 1929a — Maiuri A. 'Contributi allo studio dell'ultima fase edilizia Pompeiana'. In *Atti del I Congresso Nazionale di studi romani* 161-172. Rome, 1929.

Maiuri A 1929b — Maiuri A. 'XV Sepino (Borgata di Altilia). Iscrizioni e monumenti.' *NSc* (1929) 213-219.

Maiuri A 1932 — Maiuri A. *La casa del Menandro e il suo tesoro di argenteria.* Rome, 1932.

Maiuri A 1954 — Maiuri A. 'Fontana monumentale in bronzo nei nuovi scavi di Ercolano.' *BdA* 39 (1954) 193-199.

Maiuri A 1955 — Maiuri A. 'Il teatro-ninfeo detto <Sepolcro di Agrippina> a Bacoli.' In *Anthemon: scritti di archeologia e di antichità classiche in onore di Carlo Anti.* 263-271. Florence, 1955.

Maiuri A 1958 — Maiuri A. *Ercolano: i nuovi scavi (1927-1958).* Rome, 1958.

Maiuri B 1957 — Maiuri B. *Museo Nazionale di Napoli.* Novara, 1957.

Malaise 1972 — Malaise M. *Inventaire préliminaire des documents égyptiens découverts en Italie.* Leiden, 1972.

Manderscheid 1981 — Manderscheid H. *Die Skulpturenausstattung der kaiserzeitlichen Thermenanlagen.* Berlin, 1981.

Manderscheid 2000a — Manderscheid H. ' Überlegungen zur Wasserarchitektur und ihrer Funktion in der Villa Adriana.' *RM* 107 (2000) 109-139.

Manderscheid 2000b — Manderscheid H. 'The Water Management of Greek and Roman Baths.' In Wikander Ö (ed). *Handbook of ancient water technology 467*-535. Leiden, 2000.

Mari 1991 — Mari Z. *Tibur Pars Quarta. Forma Italiae 35*. Florence, 1991.

Marinucci 2001 — Marinucci A. 'La Maison de Diane (I iii 3-4).' In Descouedres J-P (ed.) *Ostia Port et porte de la Rome antique* 230-239. Geneva, 2001.

Marvin 1989 — Marvin M. 'Copying in Roman Sculpture: The Replica Series.' In Preciado K (ed.) *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions* 29-45. Washington, 1989. (= *Studies in the History of Art* 20 (1989)).

Massi 1844 — Massi T. *Descrizioni del nuovo braccio, Museo Chiaramonti, Museo Pio Clementino ecc.* Rome, 1844.

Mau 1898 — Mau A. 'Ausgrabungen von Pomeji. Insula VI 15.' *RM* 1898 (13) 3-59.

Mendel 1914 — Mendel G. *Catalogue des sculptures grecques, romaines et Byzantines.* Constantinople, 1914.

Michaelis 1882 — Michaelis A. *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain.* Cambridge, 1882.

Mielsch 1975 — Mielsch H. *Römische Stuckreliefs.* Heidelberg, 1975 (= *RM-EH* 21).

Mielsch 1999 — Mielsch H. *La Villa Romana con guida archeologica alle ville romane.* Florence, 1999.

Mingazzini 1957 — Mingazzini P. 'Excursus sui cosidetti ninfei'. *ArchCl 7* (1957) 156-162.

Mingazzini and Pfister 1946	Mingazzini P and Pfister F. *Forma Italiae Regio 1.2 (Surrentum)*. Florence, 1946.
MNR	Giuliano A (ed.). *Museo Nazionale Romano. Le sculture.* Rome, 1979-1995 (12 parts).
Morcelli 1785	Morcelli S A. *Indicazione antiquaria per la villa suburbana dell'eccellentissima casa Albani.* Rome, 1785.
Morcelli and Fea 1803	Fea C D F I and Morcelli S A. *Indicazione antiquaria per la villa suburbana dell'eccellentissima casa Albani.* Rome, 1803.
Moltesen 1998	Moltesen M. 'The sculptures from the Horti Sallustiani in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.' In Cima M and La Rocca E (eds.) *Horti Romani: atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma, 4-6 maggio 1995* 174-184. Rome, 1998.
Moormann 1988	Moormann E M. *La pittura parietale come fonte di conoscenza per la scultura antica.* Assen, 1988.
Moss 1988	Moss C F. *Roman Marble Tables.* PhD dissertation, Princeton, 1988.
Muscettola 1982	Muscettola S M. 'Le ciste di piombo decorate.' In *La regione sotterrata dal Vesuvio. Studi e prospettive. Atti del convegno internazionale 11-15 novembre 1979* 701-752. Naples, 1982.
Mustilli 1939	Mustilli F. *Il museo Mussolini.* Rome, 1939.
Nash 1968	Nash E. *Pictorial Dictionary of ancient Rome.* London, 1968.
Netzer 1981	Netzer E. *Greater Herodium.* Jerusalem, 1981. (= *Qedem* 13).

Netzer 1999 — Netzer E. *Die Paläste der Hasmonäer und Herodes' des Grossen.* Mainz am Rhein, 1999.

Neudecker 1988 — Neudecker R. *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien.* Mainz am Rhein, 1988.

Neudecker 1994 — Neudecker R. *Die Pracht der Latrine: zum Wandel öffentlicher Bedürfnisanstalten in der kaiserzeitlichen Stadt.* Munich, 1994.

Neuerburg 1965 — Neuerburg N. *L'architettura delle fontane e dei ninfei nell'Italia antica.* Naples, 1965.

Neuerburg 1968 — Neuerburg N. 'The Other Villas of Tivoli.' *Archaeology* 21 (1968) 288-297.

Nibby 1827 — Nibby A. *Descrizione della Villa Adriana.* Rome, 1827.

Nielsen 1994 — Nielsen I. *Hellenistic Palaces tradition and renewal.* Aarhus, 1994.

Olevano et al. 1989 — Olevano F, Arcidiacono M, Guidobaldi F, and Trucchi D. 'Le specie marmoree impiegate nella villa adrianea di Tivoli: elementi architettonici, sculture e rivestimenti.' In Dolci E (ed.) *Il marmo nella civiltà romana: la produzione e il commercio. Mostra/seminario, Museo del Marmo, Carrara, maggio-giugno 1989: atti del seminario* 138-161. Carrara, 1989.

Ortolani 1998 — Ortolani G. *Il Padiglione di Afrodite Cnidia a Villa Adriana: progetto e significato.* Rome, 1998.

Pacifici 1920 — Pacifici V. *Ippolito II d'Este: cardinale di Ferrara.* Tivoli, 1920.

Packer 1998 — Packer J. 'Mire exaedificavit: three recent books on Hadrian's Tiburtine villa'. *JRA* 11 (1998) 583-596.

Palazzo Massimo 1998 — *Palazzo Massimo alle Terme*. Milan, 1998 (English edition).

Paribeni 1902a — Paribeni R. 'IV POMPEI – Relazione degli scavi eseguiti durante il mese di maggio 1902.' *NSc* (1902) 369-374.

Paribeni 1902b — Paribeni R. 'Il borgo marinaro presso il Sarno.' *NSc* (1902) 569-578.

Paribeni 1922 — Paribeni R. 'XIV. TIVOLI (Villa Adriana)'. *NSc* (1922) 234-46.

Paribeni 1930 — Paribeni R. *The Villa of the Emperor Hadrian at Tivoli*. Milan, 1930.

Paris 1990 — Paris R. *Persona: la maschera nel teatro antico.* Rome, 1990.

Paris 2000 — Paris R (ed.) *Via Appia. La Villa dei Quintili.* Rome, 2000.

Parlasca 1958 — Parlasca K. 'Mosaikfälschungen'. *RM* 65 (1958) 155-185.

Parlasca 1988 — Parlasca K. 'Wandmosaik eines Nymphäum unter der Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rom'. *RM* 95 (1988) 159-186.

Parra 1976 — Parra M C. 'Per la definizione del rapporto fra teatri e ninfei'. *Studi classici e orientali* 25 (1976) 89-118.

Penna 1831-36 — Penna A. *Viaggio pittorico della Villa Adriana*. Rome, 1831-36 (4 vols.).

Pensabene 1976 — Pensabene P. 'Fregio in marmo nero da Villa Adriana'. *ArchCl* 28 (1976) 126-160.

Pernice 1932 — Pernice E. *Hellenistische Tische, Zisternenmündungen, Beckenuntersätze, Altäre und Truhen.* Berlin, 1932.

Petrignani 1960 — Petrignani M. 'La Domus Flavia'. *Bollettino del centro di studi per la storia dell'architettura* 16 (1960) 57-75.

Pietrangeli 1964 — Pietrangeli C. 'Munificentia Benedict XIV'. *BollMusComm* 11 (1964) 49-54.

Piranesi F 1781 — Piranesi F. *Pianta delle fabbriche esistente nella Villa Adriana.* Rome, 1781.

Piranesi G B 1778 — Piranesi G B. *Vasi, candelabri, cippi, sarcophagi, tripodi, lucerne, ed ornamenti antichi.* Rome, 1778 (2 vols.).

Piroli et al. 1804-1806 — Piroli T, Schweighaeuser J G and Petit-Radel L C F. *Les monuments antiques du Musée Napoléon (etc).* Paris, 1804-06 (4 vols.).

Pistolesi 1829 — Pistolesi E. *Il Vaticano descritto ed illustrato.* Rome, 1829 (8 vols.).

Polacco and Traversari 1988 — Polacco R and Traversari G. *Sculture romane e avori tardo-antichi del Museo archeologici di Venezia.* Rome, 1988.

Poulsen 1951 — Poulsen F. *Catalogue of ancient sculpture in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.* Copenhagen, 1951.

Purcell 1996 — Purcell N. 'The Roman Garden as Domestic Building'. In Barton I M (ed.) *Roman Domestic Buildings* 121-151. Exeter, 1996.

Quilici 1967 — Quilici L. 'La carta archeologica e monumentale del territorio del comune di Tivoli.' *Atti e memorie della Società Tiburtina di storia e d'arte* 40 (1967) 181-205.

Raeder 1983 — Raeder J. *Die statuarische Ausstattung der Villa Adriana bei Tivoli.* Frankfurt and Bern, 1983.

Rakob 1964 — Rakob F. 'Ein Grottentriklinium in Pompeji.' *RM* 71 (1964) 182-193.

Rakob 1967 — Rakob F. *Die Piazza d'Oro in der Villa Hadriana bei Tivoli.* Munich, 1967.

Rakob 1968 — Rakob F. Review of Neuerburg 1965 in *Gnomon* (1968) 317-319.

Rakob 1969 — Rakob F. 'Das römische Quellheiligtum bei Zaghouan in Tunisien.' *AA* (1969) 284-300.

Rakob 1973 — Rakob F. 'Der Bauplan einer kaiserlichen Villa.' In Hartmann W (ed.) *Festschrift Klaus Lankheit* 113-125. Cologne, 1973.

Rakob 1981 — Rakob F. 'Ambivalente Apsiden - zur Zeichensprache der römischen Architektur'. *RM* 94 (1987) 1-28.

Rediscovering Pompeii 1992 — *Rediscovering Pompeii.* (Exhibition catalogue). Rome, 1992

Reggiani 1984 — Reggiani A M. 'La politica degli interventi nell'Agro Romano: il caso di Villa Adriana.' In *Dagli scavi al museo: come ritrovamenti archeologici si costruisce il museo* 103-113. Rome, 1984.

Reichardt 1933 — Reichardt W L. 'The Vestibule Group at Hadrian's Villa'. *MAAR* 11 (1933) 127-132.

Ricci 1998 — Ricci A (ed.) *La Villa dei Quintili: fonti scritte e fonti figurate.* Rome, 1998.

Ricciardi and Santa Maria Scrinari 1996 — Ricciardi M A and Santa Maria Scrinari V (eds.). *La civiltà dell'acqua in Ostia antica.* Rome, 1996.

Richardson 1992 — Richardson L. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome.* Baltimore, 1992.

Riemann 1980 — Riemann H. 'Sperlongaprobleme'. In Krinzinger F, Otto B and Walde-Psenner (eds.) *Forschungen und Funde. Festschrift Bernhard Neutsch* 371-384. Innsbruck, 1980.

Rizzo 2001 — Rizzo S. 'Indagini nei fori Imperiali. Oroidrografia, foro di Cesare, foro di Augusto, templum Pacis.' *RM* 108 (2001) 215-244.

RMB 1824-57 — *Real museo borbonico.* Naples, 1824-1857 (16 vols.).

Roccheggiani 1804 — Roccheggiani L. *Raccolta di cento tavole rappresentanti i costumi religiosi, civili, e militari degli antichi Egiziani, Etruschi, Greci, e Romani, etc. disegnate, ed incise in rame da L. Roccheggiani. Coll'aggiunta in fine di varie dichiarazioni e d'un indice.* Rome, 1804 (2 vols.).

Roisecco 1765 — Roisecco N. *Roma antica e moderna, o sia, nuova descrizione (ecc).* Rome, 1765 (3 vols.).

Rolland 1946 — Rolland H. *Fouilles de Glanum.* Paris, 1946. (= *Gallia* Supp. 1)

Romizzi 2001 — Romizzi L. *Ville d'otium dell'Italia antica (II sec.a.C-I sec.d.C).* Naples, 2001.

Ronczewski 1903 — Ronczewski K. *Gewölbeschmuck im römischen Altertum: Studien und Aufnahmen.* Berlin, 1903.

Rossini 1826 — Rossini L. *Le antichità dei contorni di Roma ossia le più famose città del Lazio.* Rome, 1826.

Roullet 1972 — Roullet A. *The Egyptian and Egyptianising Monuments of imperial Rome.* Leiden, 1972.

Ruesch 1908 — Ruesch A (ed.). *Guida illustrata del Museo nazionale di Napoli.* Naples, 1908.

Salvatori et al. 1988 — Salvatori A, Trucchi D, Guidobaldi F. 'The marbles used in the decoration of Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli.' In Herz N (ed.) *Classical marble: geochemistry, technology, trade* 177-185. Dordrecht, 1988.

Salza Prina Ricotti 1970 — Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Le ville maritime di Silin (Leptis Magna).' *RendPontAcc* 43 (1970-1971) 135-163.

Salza Prina Ricotti 1973a — Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Villa Adriana in Pirro Ligorio e Francesco Contini.' *MemLinc* VIII 17 (1973) 1-47.

Salza Prina Ricotti 1973b — Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Criptoportici e gallerie sotterranee di Villa Adriana nella loro tipologia e nelle loro funzioni'. In *Les Cryptoportiques dans l'architecture romaine* 219-248. Paris, 1973.

Salza Prina Ricotti 1979 — Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Forme speciali di triclini'. *CronPomp* 5 (1979) 102-149.

Salza Prina Ricotti 1982	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Villa Adriana nei suoi limiti e nella sua funzionalità'. *MemPontAcc* 14 (1982) 25-55.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1987	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'The importance of water in Roman garden triclinia'. In MacDougall E B (ed.) *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens* 137-184. Washington DC, 1987.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1989	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Il sisteme di irrigazione della Piazza d'Oro.' *RendPontAcc* 62 (1989-90) 121-157.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1992	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Nascita e sviluppo di Villa Adriana'. *RendPontAcc* 65 (1992-93) 41-73.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1993	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Lavacra pro sexibus separavit.' *RendPontAcc* 66 (1993-94) 77-110.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1994a	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Villa Adriana: un sogno fatto pietra'. *Archeo* 117 (November 1994) 64-109.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1994b	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Ricerca archeologica ed analisi dei terreni il caso di Villa Adriana'. *RendPontAcc* 67 (1994-95) 69-85.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1996	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Gli edifici di spettacolo e il modellino dello stadio di villa Adriana.' *RendPontAcc* 69 (1996-97) 107-153.
Salza Prina Ricotti 1998	Salza Prina Ricotti E. 'Adriano: architettura del verde e dell'acqua'. In Cima M and La Rocca E (eds.) *Horti Romani: atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma, 4-6 maggio 1995* 363-400. Rome, 1998.
Salza Prina Ricotti 2001	Salza Prina Ricotti E. *Villa Adriana : il sogno di un imperatore.* Rome, 2001.

Sampaolo 1995 — Sampaolo V. 'Il ninfeo a mosaico di Marina della Lobra (Massalubrense).' In *Atti del II Colloquio dell'Associazione italiana del mosaico* 61-70. Bordighera, 1995.

Schefold 1962 — Schefold K. *Vergessenes Pompeji: unveroffentlichte Bilder romischer Wanddekorationen in geschichtlicher Folge.* Bern, 1962.

Schreiber 1879 — Schreiber T. 'Museo Torlonia in Trastevere'. *AZ* 37 (1879) 63-78.

Sciarelli 1983 — Sciarelli G T (ed.). *Baia: il ninfeo imperiale sommerso di Punta Epitaffio.* Naples, 1983.

Scott 1983 — Scott J. 'Some sculpture from Hadrian's Villa, Tivoli'. In *Piranesi e la cultura antiquaria, gli antecedenti e il contesto: atti del convegno 14-17 novembre 197* 339-347. Rome, 1983.

Sear 1975 — Sear F. 'The earliest wall mosaics in Italy.' *PBSR* 43 (1975) 83-97.

Sear 1977 — Sear F. *Roman Wall and Vault Mosaics.* Heidelberg, 1977 (= *JdI-EH* 23).

Sebastiani 1828 — Sebastiani F A. *Viaggio a Tivoli antichissima città Latino-sabina fatto nel 1825.* Fuligno, 1828.

Segala and Sciortino 1999 — Segala E and Sciortino I. *Domus Aurea.* Milan, 1999 (English edition).

Seni 1902 — Seni F S. *La Villa d'Este in Tivoli: memorie storiche tratta da documenti inediti.* Rome, 1902.

Settis 1968 — Settis S. 'Ninfei romani e ninfei greci'. *RivFil* 96 (1968) 111-120.

Settis 1973 — Settis S. "Esedra' e 'ninfeo' nella terminologia architettonica del mondo romano. Dall'età repubblicana alla tarda antichità.' *ANRW* I.4 (1973) 661-740.

Smith A C G 1978 — Smith A C G. 'The Date of the 'Grandi Terme' of Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli'. *PBSR* 46 (1978) 73-93.

Smith A H 1892-1904 — Smith A H. *A catalogue of sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum.* London, 1892-1904 (3 vols.).

Smith A H 1901 — Smith A H. 'Gavin Hamilton's Letters to Charles Towneley'. *JHS* (1901) 307-311.

Smith R R R 1991 — Smith R R R. *Hellenistic Sculpture.* London, 1991.

Spano 1910 — Spano G. 'III POMPEI – Relazione sulle scoperte avvenute dal 1 gennaio al 30 giugno 1910. Scavi eseguiti nell'isola VI della regione IV.' *NSc* (1910) 437-486.

Spinazzola 1928 — Spinazzola V. *Le arti decorative in Pompei e nel Museo Nazionale di Napoli.* Milan, 1928.

Spinazzola 1953 — Spinazzola V. *Pompei alla luce degli scavi nuovi di Via dell'Abbondanza (anni 1910-1923).* Rome, 1953.

Spinola 2000 — Spinola G. *Il Museo Pio Clementino.* Città del Vaticano, 2000. (= *Guide cataloghi dei Musei Vaticani* (3)2).

Steinby 1989 — Steinby M (ed.) *Lacus Iuturnae I.* Rome, 1989.

Stierlin 1984 — Stierlin H. *Hadrien et l'architecture romaine.* Paris, 1984.

Syme 1982 — Syme R. 'Spaniards at Tivoli'. *Ancient Society* 13-14 (1982-83) 241-264.

Talamo 1998 — Talamo E. 'Gli Horti di Sallustio a Porta Collina.' In Cima M and La Rocca E (eds.) *Horti Romani: atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma, 4-6 maggio 1995* 113-170. Rome, 1998.

Tamm 1963 — Tamm B. *Auditorium and Palatium.* Stockholm, 1963.

Tamm 1973 — Tamm B. 'Some notes on Roman houses.' *OpRom* 9 (1973) 53-60.

Tanzer 1924 — Tanzer H H. *The villas of Pliny the Younger.* New York, 1924.

Taylor 2003 — Taylor R M. *Roman builders; a study in architectural process.* Cambridge, 2003.

Teja 1990 — Teja A. 'Die Villa Hadriana in Tivoli: ein Gymnasion großen Stils?.' *Stadion* 16 (1990) 67-71.

Tiberi 1957 — Tiberi C. 'Il culto degli Dèi Samothraci nel Canopo della Villa di Adriano presso Tivoli.' *Atti e memorie della Società Tiburtina di storia e d'arte* 30 (1957-58) 47-76.

Tiberi 1959 — Tiberi C. 'I santuari dei grandi Dèi e il Canopo della Villa di Adriano presso Tivoli'. *Atti e memorie della Società Tiburtina di storia e d'arte* 32-3 (1959-60) 15-40.

Tobin 1997 — Tobin J. *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens.* Amsterdam, 1997.

Tölle-Kastenbein 1992 — Tölle-Kastenbein R. 'Okeanus als Inbegriff'. In Brehm O and Klie S (eds.) *Mousikos aner: Festschrift für Max Wegner zum 90 Geburtstag* 445-454. Bonn, 1992.

Torelli 1991 — Torelli M. 'Da Sparta a Villa Adriana: le terme dell'Arapissa, il ginnasio del Platanistas el il Teatro Marittimo.' In Gnade M (ed.) *Stips votiva: papers presented to C M Stibbe* 226-232. Amsterdam, 1991.

Tran 1988 — Tam Tinh Tran, V. *La Casa dei Cervi à Herculanum.* Rome, 1988.

Ueblacker 1985 — Ueblacker M. *Das Teatro Marittimo in der Villa Adriana.* Mainz, 1985.

Van Deman 1934 — Van Deman E B. *The building of the Roman aqueducts.* Washington, 1934.

Varming 1965 — Varming J C. 'Fontane Romane: studi di quattro antiche vasche da fontana monolitiche'. *AnalRom* 3 (1965) 85-137.

Venturi 1890 — Venturi A. 'Nouvi documenti. Ricerche di Antichità per Monte Giordano, Monte Cavallo e Tivoli nel secolo XVI. *Archivio storico dell'arte* 3 (1890) 196-206.

Vermeule 1973 — Vermeule C C. *A catalogue of the classical antiquities in Sir John Soane's Museum.* Boston, Mass., 1973.

Vermeule 1977 — Vermeule C C. *Greek Sculpture and Roman Taste.* Ann Arbor, 1977.

Vermeule 1981 — Vermeule C C. *Roman Decorative Art from Julius Caesar to Honorius. Notes and bibliographies based on the plates of Pierre Gusman, L'Art décoratif de Rome de la fin de la république au Ive siècle, Paris 1908-1914.* Boston, Mass., 1981.

Vespignani and Visconti 1874 — Vespignani C and Visconti C L. 'Antica sala da recitazioni ovvero Auditorio scoperto tra le ruine degli Orti Mecenaziani sull'Esquilino.' *BullCom* (1874) 137-171.

Vighi 1958 — Vighi R. *Villa Adriana.* Rome, 1958.

Vigna Barberini 2001 — *Il giardino dei Cesari: dai palazzi antichi all Vigna Barberini, sul Monte Palatino.* (Exhibition catalogue). Rome, 2001.

Visconti C L 1885 — Visconti C L. *I monumenti del Museo Torlonia.* Rome, 1885.

Visconti E Q 1818-22 — Visconti E Q. *Il museo Pio Clementino.* Milan, 1818-22 (7 vols.).

Visconti and Clarac 1820 — Visconti E Q and Clarac C O F J P. *Description des antiques du Musée royal etc.* Paris, 1820.

Voute 1972 — Voute P. ' Notes sur l'iconographie d'Océan'. *MEFRA* 84 (1972) 639-673.

Wadsworth 1924 — Wadsworth E L. 'Stucco reliefs of the first and second centuries in Rome'. *MAAR* 4 (1924) 9-102.

Waldhauer 1928 — Waldhauer O F. *Die antiken Skulpturen der Ermitage.* Berlin 1928.

Walker 1987 — Walker S. 'Roman Nymphaea in the Greek World'. In Macready S and Thompson F H (eds.) *Roman Architecture in the Greek World* 60-71. London, 1987.

Wallace-Hadrill 1994 — Wallace-Hadrill A. *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Princeton, 1994.

Ward Perkins 1955 — Ward Perkins J B. 'Notes on Southern Etruria and the Ager Veientanus (with an Appendix by Martin Frederiksen.' *PBSR* 23 (1955) 44-72.

Wataghin Cantino 1966 — Wataghin Cantino G. *La Domus Augustana: personalità e problemi dell'architettura flavia*. Turin, 1966.

Waywell 1997 — Waywell G B. 'The Scylla monument from Bargylia.' *AntP* 25 (1997) 75-119.

Wild 1981 — Wild R A. *Water in the cultic worship of Isis and Sarapis*. Leiden, 1981.

Wilson 1999 — Wilson A. 'Deliveries *extra urbem*: aqueducts and the countryside.' *JRA* 12 (1999) 314-331.

Winnefeld 1895 — Winnefeld H. *Die Villa des Hadrian bei Tivoli*. Berlin, 1895 (= *RM-EH* 3).

Wirth 1934 — Wirth F. *Römische Wandmalerei: vom Untergang Pompejis bis ans Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts*. Berlin, 1934.

Wojcik 1986 — Wojcik M R. *La Villa dei Papiri ad Ercolano: contributo alla ricostruzione dell'ideologia della nobilitas tardorepubblicana*. Rome, 1986.

Yegül 1991 — Yegül F K. *Gentlemen of instinct and breeding. Architecture at the American Academy in Rome 1894-1940.* New York, 1991.

Yegül 1992 — Yegül F K. *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity.* New York, 1992.

Zander 1958 — Zander G. 'La Domus Aurea: nuovi problemi architettonici.' *BCSSA* 12 (1958) 47-64.

Zanker 1998 — Zanker P. *Pompeii: public and private life.* Cambridge, Mass. 1998.

Zappi 1920 — Zappi G M. *Annali e memorie di Tivoli di Giovanni Maria Zappi.* Pacifici V (ed.). Tivoli 1920. (= *Studi e fonti per la storia della regione tiburtina* I).

Zevi 1984 — Zevi F (ed.). *Pompei 79: raccolta di studi per il decmonono centenario dell'eruzione vesuviana.* Naples, 1984.

Blank In Original